arXiv:1510.05777v1 [math.MG] 20 Oct 2015

COMPACTNESS THEOREMS FOR THE SPACES OF DISTANCE MEASURE SPACES AND RIEMANN SURFACE LAMINATIONS

DIVAKARAN DIVAKARAN AND SIDDHARTHA GADGIL

Abstract. In this paper, we give a generalisation of Gromov's compactness theorem for metric spaces, more precisely, we give a compactness theorem for the space of distance measure spaces equipped with a *generalised Gromov-Hausdorff-Levi-Prokhorov distance*. Using this result we prove that the Deligne-Mumford compactification is the completion of the moduli space of Riemann surfaces under the generalised Gromov-Hausdorff-Levi-Prokhorov distance. Further we prove a compactness theorem for the space of Riemann surface laminations.

1. Introduction

Since the landmark work of Gromov, a very fruitful technique in Riemannian geometry is to consider limits of Riemannian manifolds that are of a more general nature, such as metric spaces. The limits are taken in the sense of the *Gromov-Hausdorff* distance, which can be defined for compact metric spaces or for metric spaces with given base points. As Riemannian manifolds are equipped with canonical measures, namely volumes, it has also turned out to be fruitful to consider limits of these as metric measure spaces.

However, one case of fundamental importance in mathematics, the Deligne-Mumford compactification of the Moduli space of Riemann surfaces, or equivalently hyperbolic surfaces, cannot be naturally viewed (at least directly) in this setting. This is because the limit of hyperbolic surfaces is not compact, and indeed has in general several non-compact components. However, a limit using basepoints will only have one limiting non-compact component. This work is motivated by the desire to generalize convergence of metric measure spaces to include this case in a natural way, and furthermore allow us to study limits of surface laminations.

Specifically, we study *distance measure spaces*, where a distance is like a metric except that distances between the points may be infinite. A significant part of this work is devoted to defining an appropriate distance in this setting, and establishing all the desired properties of this distance.

One of the attractive features of our approach is that the Margulis lemma, which has a pivotal role in studying limits of hyperbolic metrics, has an elementary reformulation that is meaningful in contexts other that surfaces. Namely, for hyperbolic surfaces of a fixed genus g, given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a real number $M > 0$ so that each hyperbolic surface F of genus g has a finite set of at most M points whose ϵ-neighbourhood has complement in F with measure less than ϵ. In other words, there are ϵ-almost ϵ-dense finite sets with uniformly bounded cardinality. As a consequence, the Deligne-Mumford compactification turns out to have a very natural description, namely it is the *completion* of the space of hyperbolic metrics (with respect to our metric).

We also study the limits of hyperbolic surface laminations in the same sense. Indeed, the above allows us to also state a natural analogue of Margulis lemma in the case of hyperbolic surface laminations. However it turns out that this analogous statement is false. Hence our result needs as hypothesis something equivalent to the Margulis lemma.

In the rest of the introduction, we elaborate on the above remarks.

1.1. **Gromov's compactness theorem for metric spaces.** Gromov's notion of the Gromov-Hausdorff distance, an intrinsic version of the Hausdorff distance, was a major turning point in the history of global Riemannian geometry. The Gromov-Hausdorff distance is a distance on the space of compact metric spaces. Introduced in connection with the study of almost flat manifolds, it was used by Gromov to prove that a finitely generated group has polynomial growth if and only if it has a nilpotent subgroup that is of finite index. Later, it became an important tool in geometric group theory. We recall the definition.

Definition 1.1 (ε–neighbourhood)**.** Given a metric space (X, d), a set $S \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the ε-neighbourhood of S is given by

$$S^{\varepsilon} = \{x \in X |\ \exists s \in S, d(x, s) < \varepsilon\} = \cup_{s \in S} \{x \in X |\ d(x, s) < \varepsilon\}$$

Definition 1.2 (Hausdorff distance)**.** Let X and Y be two non-empty subsets of a metric space (M, d). We define the Hausdorff distance $d_H(X, Y)$ as

$$d_H(X, Y) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 |\ X \subseteq Y^{\varepsilon} \text{ and } Y \subseteq X^{\varepsilon}\}$$

Some properties:

- In general, $d_H(X, Y)$ may be infinite. For example, take $(M, d) = (\mathbb{R}, d(x, y) = |x - y|)$ and $X = [0, 1]$ and $Y = \mathbb{R}$. If both X and Y are bounded, then $d_H(X, Y)$ is guaranteed to be finite.
- We have $d_H(X, Y) = 0$ if and only if X and Y have the same closure.
- On the set of all non-empty compact subsets of M, d_H is a metric.

Definition 1.3 (Gromov-Hausdorff distance)**.** Let (X_i, d_i), $i = 1, 2$, be compact metric spaces. Consider pairs of isometric embeddings $\iota_i : X_i \to Z$, $i = 1, 2$ of X_i into a metric space Z. For such embeddings we can consider the Hausdorff distance d_H between $\iota_i(X_i)$ as subsets of Z. The Gromov-Hausdorff distance is the infimum over all such Hausdorff distances, i.e.,

$$d_{GH}(X_1, X_2) = \inf\{d_H(\iota_1(X_1), \iota_2(X_2)) \,|\, \iota_i : X_i \to Z \text{ isometric embeddings}\}.$$

Gromov proved a compactness theorem for the space of metric spaces equipped with this metric.

Theorem 1.4 (Gromov compactness theorem)**.** *A collection of compact metric spaces is pre-compact under the Gromov-Hausdorff distance if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- *There exists $C > 0$, such that every element in the collection has diameter less than or equal to C.*
- *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a natural number $N(\varepsilon)$, such that every element of the collection admits an ε-net containing no more than $N(\varepsilon)$ points.*

This theorem has various applications including study of manifolds with Ricci curvature bounded below, Einstein metrics etc.

1.2. **Compactification of the moduli space of Riemann surface and its applications.** The moduli space of Riemann surfaces is the space of all Riemann surfaces of a fixed topological type up to biholomorphism. This spaces is not compact, as sequences of such surfaces can degenerate. However there is a very elegant compactification of moduli space due to Bers, Mumford and Deligne.

The Deligne-Mumford compactification of the moduli space of Riemann surfaces and the closely related Gromov compactness theorem for J-holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds (in particular curves in an algebraic varieties) are important results for many areas of mathematics. A major reason for this is that the additional strata added in the compactification have co-dimension at least 2. This means that the moduli spaces have fundamental classes, and can be treated as compact manifolds from the point of view of intersection theory. This allows the construction of so called Gromov invariants, counting the number of such curves.

Furthermore, the explicit nature of the compactification allows us to understand, and sometimes rule out, degenerate curves. Such an approach allowed Gromov to prove many important results in symplectic geometry.

As the strata of the compactification are well understood, one can use their rich underlying structure to define and show algebraic properties of extensions of intersection numbers, giving Gromov-Witten theory and quantum cohomology. Such structures were used by Kontsevich to answer classical questions in enumerative geometry.

1.3. **Motivation.** A sequence of compact hyperbolic surfaces may converge to a non-compact hyperbolic surface. Moreover, the limit space in the Deligne-Mumford compactification is not a metric space; the distance between two points can be ∞. Such spaces are called distance spaces.



Distance between p and q is infinity

While studying non-compact spaces, one usually uses pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence rather than Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. We recall the definition.

Definition 1.5 (Pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence)**.** A sequence of pointed spaces (X_n, x_n) is said to converge to a pointed space (X, x) if, for every $r > 0$, the closed r ball $\overline{B(x_n, r)}$ converges to the closed r ball $\overline{B(x, r)}$ in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense.

This notion is not very useful to study distance spaces as, by pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence the maximum we can hope to retrieve is the information of the component in which the point x lies, that is, all points which are at a finite distance from x. For the same reason, the use of pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence in the study of moduli space of Riemann surfaces is limited.



One way to overcome this is to take several base points but, there is no natural way to do so. It is also very messy. We have instead used the approach of choosing a finite measure and using a generalised Gromov-Hausdorff-Levy-Prokhorov(GHLP) distance. This can be viewed as a generalisation of the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. The fact that many metric spaces, especially Riemannian manifolds, come equipped naturally with a measure is further motivation for the use of measure instead of multiple points. Moreover, it turns out that the Deligne-Mumford compactification has a very natural description using this metric, namely it is the *completion* of the space of hyperbolic surfaces.

While Gromov's compactness theorem for J-holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds, is an important tool in symplectic topology, its applicability is limited by the lack of general methods to construct pseudo-holomorphic curves. One hopes that considering a more general class of objects in place of pseudo-holomorphic curves will be useful. Generalising the domain of pseudo-holomorphic curves from Riemann surfaces to Riemann surface laminations is a natural choice.

Riemann surface laminations are generalisations of classical Riemann surfaces. More precisely, a Riemann surface lamination is a locally compact, separable, metrisable space M with an open cover by flow boxes $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ and homeomorphisms $\phi_i : U_i \to D_i \times T_i$ with D_i an open set in $\mathbb{C}$ such that the coordinate changes in $U_i \cap U_j$ are of the form

$$\phi_j \circ \phi_i^{-1}(z,t) = (\lambda_{ji}(z,t), \tau_{ji}(t))$$

where the map $z \to \lambda_{ji}(z,t)$ is holomorphic for each t. Riemann surface laminations, coming from the qualitative study of ordinary differential equations in complex domain, have become central to the theory of holomorphic dynamical systems. They occur naturally in many geometric and dynamical situations.

Theorems such as the uniformisation theorem for surface laminations due to Alberto Candel (which is a partial generalisation of the uniformisation theorem for surfaces), generalisations of the Gauss-Bonnet theorem proved for some special cases, and topological classification of "almost all" leaves using harmonic measures tell us that Riemann surface laminations exhibit many properties similar to Riemann surfaces. Further, the success of essential laminations, as generalised incompressible surfaces, in the study of 3-manifolds suggests that a similar approach may be useful in symplectic topology.

Compactness of the moduli space of Riemann surfaces was central in the use of pseudo-holomorphic curves to study symplectic 4-manifolds. So, a compactness theorem for the space of Riemann surface laminations, analogous to the Deligne-Mumford compactification would be very useful. In this paper we prove such a result. However, as it turns out that there is no result analogous to the Margulis lemma, our result needs as hypothesis something equivalent to the Margulis lemma.

2. Metric geometry

2.1. **Distance spaces.** A distance space is a generalisation of a metric space where, we allow the distance between two points to be infinity. More precisely,

Definition 2.1. A tuple (X, d) is called a distance space if X is a set and $d : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ ($\mathbb{R}^+$ denotes the set of all non-negative real numbers) is such that

- $d(x, y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$.
- $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$.
- For all z in X, $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$.

Associated with a distance space there is the natural topology, generated by balls of radius r, $B(x_0, r) = \{x \in X \mid d(x, x_0) < r\}$, as in the case of metric space. We begin with a few examples.

Example 2.2. A very simple but very useful example of a distance space is a finite set X with a distance, i.e., a function to $[0, \infty]$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 2.1.

Example 2.3. Let $X := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$ and define the distance d as

- $d(0, 0) = 0$.
- If $x > 0$, $d(x, 0) = \infty$.
- If $x, y \neq 0$ then, $d(x, y) = |\log(x) - \log(y)|$.

This example is related to hyperbolic geometry. As distance element, we have used $\frac{1}{x}dx$ instead of dx.

We will show that a distance space is a disjoint union of metric spaces in a canonical manner. Thus, many properties of distance spaces follow from the analogous properties of metric spaces, by applying them to each component metric space. Fix a distance space $X = (X, d)$.

Definition 2.4. Let $\sim$ be the relation on X given by $x \sim y$ if and only if $d(x, y)$ is finite.

Theorem 2.5. *The relation $\sim$ is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. The fact that $\sim$ is reflexive and symmetric is obvious. Transitivity follows from the triangle inequality. More precisely, $x \sim y$ and $y \sim z$ means that $d(x, y)$ and $d(y, z)$ are finite. As $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$, $d(x, z)$ is finite. Hence $x \sim z$. □

Clearly, each equivalence class, under the equivalence relation $\sim$, is a metric space. Thus, we have represented the distance space X as a disjoint union of metric spaces. We will use this fact to prove some results, some of which will be used later.

Theorem 2.6. *Each equivalence class of X under $\sim$ is open.*

Proof. Let $Y \subset X$ be an equivalence class. Given $x_0 \in Y$, $B(x_0, 1) \subset Y$ as, if $x \in B(x_0, 1)$, then $d(x, x_0) < 1 < \infty$, so $x \sim x_0$, i.e., $x \in Y$. As $x_0 \in Y$ was arbitrary, Y is open. □

Theorem 2.7. *Each equivalence class of X under $\sim$ is closed.*

Proof. Note that the complement of an equivalence class Y is a union of equivalence classes, each of which is open. Hence $X \setminus Y$ is open, i.e., Y is closed. □

Theorem 2.8. *A distance space (or a metric space) is separable if and only if it is second countable.*

Proof. Separable implies second countable: As X is separable, there is a countable dense set, say S. Thus, given any point $x \in X$, there exists a sequence $\langle s_k \rangle_k \subset S$, such that s_k converges to x. Let U be an open set containing x. Note that $d(x, U^c) > 0$. Choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{2}{n_0} < d(x, U^c)$. The open sets $B\left(s_k, \frac{1}{n_0}\right), \forall k$ will eventually contain x as s_k converges to x. Let k_0 be large enough that, $x \in B\left(s_{k_0}, \frac{1}{n_0}\right)$. If $y \in B\left(s_{k_0}, \frac{1}{n_0}\right)$ then,

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x, s_k) + d(y, s_k) \leq \frac{2}{n_0} < d(x, U^c).$$

So, $B\left(s_{k_0}, \frac{1}{n_0}\right) \subset U$. Thus, the countable collection of open sets $\left\{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(s)\right\}_{s \in S, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ forms a basis.

Second countable implies separable: Let $\{U_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a basis. Consider the countable set $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ where x_i is an arbitrary point in U_i. We claim that $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a dense subset. To prove this, consider an arbitrary point x. As $\{U_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a basis, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find an element U_{i_n} such that $U_{i_n} \subset B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x)$. Thus, $d\left(x_{i_n}, x\right) \leq \frac{1}{n}$, i.e., x_{i_n} converges to x. □

Lemma 2.9. *If a distance space (or a metric space) X is second countable, then $Y \subset X$ is second countable under the subspace topology.*

Proof. Let $\{U_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable basis for X, i.e., given any point $x \in X$ and an open set U containing x, we can find a $U_{i(x,U)}$ such that $x \in U_{i(x,U)} \subset U$. Given a point $x \in Y$ and a set V open in Y with $x \in V \subset Y$, choose a U open in X such that $V = U \cap Y$. The existence of such a set U follows from the definition of subspace topology. Now, there exists a $U_{i(x,U)}$ such that $x \in U_{i(x,U)} \subset U$. Thus, $x \in U_{i(x,U)} \cap Y \subset U \cap Y = V$. Hence, $\{U_i \cap Y\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a basis for Y. Thus, Y is second countable □

Lemma 2.10. *If a distance space (or a metric space) X is separable, then $Y \subset X$ is separable under the subspace topology.*

Proof. As X is separable it is second countable, by Theorem 2.8. Thus Y is second countable, by Theorem 2.9 and the fact that X is second countable. Hence, Y is separable by Theorem 2.8. □

Theorem 2.11. *A distance space is separable if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *There are only a countable number of equivalence classes under $\sim$.*
- *Each equivalence class under $\sim$ is separable.*

Proof. To prove the if part we use Theorem 2.8. As each equivalence class is separable, it is second countable. So, we get a countable basis for each equivalence class. There are only a countable number of equivalence classes and the countable union of countable sets is countable. So, we get a countable basis for the distance space. Thus the distance space is second countable. Use Theorem 2.8 again to get the result.

As X is separable it is second countable, by Theorem 2.8. The equivalence classes are open and disjoint. So for each equivalence class there exists at least one basis element. As X is second countable, there are at most countably many equivalence classes. Each equivalence class is separable by Lemma 2.10. □

Theorem 2.12. *A subset, S, of a distance space, X, is compact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *S intersects only finitely many equivalence classes under $\sim$.*
- *The intersection of S with each equivalence class is compact.*

Proof. The if part follows from the fact that the finite union of compacts sets is compact. On the other hand, suppose S is compact. It cannot intersect infinitely many equivalence classes as, taking an arbitrary point from each of them gives a sequence which will have no convergent subsequence. Further, if Y is an equivalence class under $\sim$, then $Y \cap S$ is compact by Theorem 2.7 and the fact that a closed subset of a compact set is compact. □

2.2. **Metric measure spaces and Distance measure spaces.**

Definition 2.13. A metric measure space is a triple (X, d, μ), where (X, d) forms a metric space and μ is a finite regular Borel measure.

Definition 2.14. A distance measure space is a triple (X, d, μ), where (X, d) forms a distance space and μ is a finite regular Borel measure.

An important class of examples is (X, d, μ) where, X is a finite set. We will in fact show that any distance measure space, with finite measure, can be approximated with such a space.

2.3. **Gromov-Hausdorff-Levy-Prokhorov distance.**

In this section we will recall the definition of the Gromov-Hausdorff-Levy-Prokhorov distance. For this part we closely follow the approach in [GK13], but we use a different-but-equivalent definition of the Levy-Prokhorov metric. Here we assume the measure μ to be finite but, not necessarily a probability measure. The two definitions coincide when we use probability measures. A good general reference for the subject is [Gro07]. For some recent developments see [GPW09]. We will later generalise the Gromov-Hausdorff-Levy-Prokhorov distance to distance measure spaces.

Definition 2.15 (Borel Measure)**.** Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let Borel σ-algebra, $\mathcal{B}(X)$, be the smallest σ-algebra that contains the open sets of X. Any measure μ defined on the Borel σ-algebra is called a Borel measure.

Definition 2.16 (Levy-Prokhorov metric)**.** Let $\mathcal{B}(M)$ represent the Borel σ-algebra on M. The Levy-Prokhorov metric d_π between two finite Borel measures μ, ν is defined as

$$d_\pi(\mu,\nu) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid \mu(A) \leq \nu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \text{ and } \nu(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(M)\}.$$

Definition 2.17. If $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we define scaling of a measure $c\mu$ as $(c\mu)(E) := c.\mu(E)$.

Lemma 2.18. *If $c \leq 1$ then $d_\pi(c\mu, c\nu) \leq d(\mu,\nu)$.*

Proof. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\mu(E) \leq \nu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$, we have

$$c\mu(E) \leq c\nu(E^\varepsilon) + c\varepsilon \leq c\nu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon.$$

Similarly, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\nu(E) \leq \mu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ we have $c\nu(E) \leq c\mu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. The result follows. □

Lemma 2.19. *If $c \geq 1$ then $d_\pi(c\mu, c\nu) \leq c.d_\pi(\mu,\nu)$*

Proof. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\mu(E) \leq \nu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ we have

$$c\mu(E) \leq c\nu(E^\varepsilon) + c\varepsilon \leq c\nu(E^{c\varepsilon}) + c\varepsilon.$$

Similarly, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\nu(E) \leq \mu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ we have $c\nu(E) \leq c\mu(E^{c\varepsilon}) + c\varepsilon$. The result follows. □

Definition 2.20. Given measurable spaces (X_1, Σ_1) and (X_2, Σ_2), a measurable mapping $f : X_1 \to X_2$ and a measure $\mu : \Sigma_1 \to [0,\infty]$, the push-forward measure of μ is defined to be the measure $f_*(\mu) : \Sigma_2 \to [0,\infty]$ given by

$$(f_*(\mu))(B) = \mu(f^{-1}(B)) \text{ for } B \in \Sigma_2$$

Lemma 2.21. *Let (X,d) and (X',d') be two distance spaces and let $f : (X,d) \hookrightarrow (X',d')$ be an isometric embedding. If μ_1, μ_2 are two measures on (X,d) then,*

$$d_\pi^{(X,d)}(\mu_1,\mu_2) = d_\pi^{(X',d')}(f_*(\mu_1), f_*(\mu_2))$$

Proof. Let B be an arbitrary subset of X'. Note that $f_*(\mu_i)(B) = f_*(\mu_i)(B \cap f(X))$. Thus, while calculating d_π we have to consider only subsets of $f(X)$. So without loss of generality assume $B \subset f(X)$. Let $A = f^{-1}(B)$. By definition, $\mu_i(A) = (f_*(\mu_i))(B)$. As f is injective, for all $S \subset X$, $f^{-1}(f(S)) = S$. Thus, $(f_*(\mu_i))(f(A^\varepsilon)) = \mu_i(f^{-1}(f(A^\varepsilon))) = \mu_i(A^\varepsilon)$. But, $f(A^\varepsilon) = B^\varepsilon \cap f(X)$ as, f is an isomorphism. So, $\mu_i(A^\varepsilon) = (f_*(\mu_i))(f(A^\varepsilon)) = f_*(\mu_i)(B^\varepsilon)$.

For all $\varepsilon > d_\pi^{(X,d)}(\mu_1,\mu_2)$, we have $\mu_1(A) \leq \mu_2(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ and $\mu_2(A) \leq \mu_1(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. Thus, $f_*(\mu_1)(B) \leq f_*(\mu_2)(B^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ and $f_*(\mu_2)(B) \leq f_*(\mu_1)(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. Hence $d_\pi^{(X,d)}(\mu_1,\mu_2)$ is less than or equal to $d_\pi^{(X',d')}(f_*(\mu_1), f_*(\mu_2))$. Similarly, for all $\varepsilon > d_\pi^{(X',d')}(f_*(\mu_1), f_*(\mu_2))$ we have, $f_*(\mu_1)(B) \leq f_*(\mu_2)(B^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ and $f_*(\mu_2)(B) \leq f_*(\mu_1)(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. Thus, we have $\mu_1(A) \leq \mu_2(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ and $\mu_2(A) \leq \mu_1(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. Hence $d_\pi^{(X,d)}(\mu_1,\mu_2)$ is greater than or equal to $d_\pi^{(X',d')}(f_*(\mu_1), f_*(\mu_2))$. Combining the two we have the result. □

Definition 2.22 (Gromov-Hausdorff-Levy-Prokhorov Distance)**.** We now define the Gromov-Hausdorff-Levy-Prokhorov distance (GHLP distance, d_{GHLP}) between a pair of metric measure spaces $(X_i, d_i, \mu_i), i = 1, 2$, with the underlying metric space X_i assumed to be compact. Consider isometric embeddings $\iota_i : X_i \to Z, i = 1, 2$ of the spaces X_i into a metric space Z. These give rise to push forward probability measures $(\iota_i)_*(\mu_i)$ on Z, given by $(\iota_i)_*(\mu_i)(E) = \mu_i(\iota_i^{-1}(E))$. The distance between the metric measure spaces is the infimum of the distance between the push forward measures over all isometric embeddings, i.e.,

$$d_{GHLP}(X_1, X_2) = inf\{d_\pi((\iota_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_2)_*(\mu_2)) \mid \iota_i : X_i \to Z \text{ isometric embeddings}\}$$

where Z in the infimum varies over all metric spaces.

We can identify the space X_i with its image in Z. Further we can assume that, under these assumptions $Z = X_1 \cup X_2$. We shall often make such identifications and identify the measures μ_i with the push forward measures on Z.

Theorem 2.23. *GHLP distance satisfies the triangle inequality.*

Proof. The proof is the same as that of the corresponding result in [GK13]. □

As the GHLP distance ignores sets of measure zero, we cannot expect an isometry between the two spaces (X_1, d_1, μ_1) and (X_2, d_2, μ_2) given that the distance between two spaces $d_{GHLP}((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) = 0$, but only that this is true up to ignoring an appropriate class of sets with measure zero.

Lemma 2.24. *If $d_{GHLP}((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) = 0$, then $\mu_1(X_1) = \mu_2(X_2)$.*

Proof. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a metric space $(Z(\varepsilon), d(\varepsilon))$ and isometries

$$\iota_i : (X_i, d_i) \to (Z(\varepsilon), d(\varepsilon))$$

such that the push forward measures $\nu_i = (\iota_i)_*(\mu_i)$ are at a distance ε from each other. But, $\nu_i(Z(\varepsilon)) = \mu_i(X_i)$. Thus,

$$|\mu_1(X_1) - \mu_2(X_2)| = |\nu_1(Z(\varepsilon)) - \nu_2(Z(\varepsilon))| \leq \varepsilon.$$

As ε was arbitrary, we get $\mu_1(X_1) = \mu_2(X_2)$. □

Theorem 2.25. *For two metric measure spaces (X_1, d_1, μ_1) and (X_2, d_2, μ_2),*

$$d_{GHLP}((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) = 0$$

if and only if there are open sets U_1 and U_2 of measure zero such that there is a measure preserving isometry between $(X_1 \setminus U_1)$ and $(X_2 \setminus U_2)$.

Proof. If there is a measure preserving isometry ϕ from $(X_1 \setminus U_1)$ to $(X_2 \setminus U_2)$, then let Z be equal to X_2. Then we get that

$$d_{GHLP}((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_1, d_2, \mu_2)) \leq d_\pi(\phi_*(\mu_1), \mu_2) = 0.$$

On the other hand assume $d_{GHLP}((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) = 0$. We have, by Lemma 2.24 and Lemma 2.18, that

$$d_{GHLP}\left(\left(X_1, d_1, \frac{1}{\mu_1(X_1)}\mu_1\right), \left(X_2, d_2, \frac{1}{\mu_2(X_2)}\mu_2\right)\right) = 0.$$

Then by the corresponding result for probability measures (see [GK13],for example) we get the required result. □

3. Distance measure spaces

3.1. **Distance on the space of distance measure spaces.** We will generalise the idea of the GHLP distance to get a distance on the space of distance measure spaces. We first consider some illustrative examples.

Example 3.1. Let $X = \{x, y\}$, $d_1 = d_2 = d$ where d is defined as follows:

- $d(x, x) = 0 = d(y, y)$.
- $d(x, y) = d$ for some fixed $d \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

and let $\mu_1(x) = 1$, $\mu_1(y) = 0$ and $\mu_2(x) = 1$ and $\mu_2(y) = \varepsilon$ be two measures on X. In the GHLP distance, the two metric measure spaces, (X, d, μ_1) and (X, d, μ_2), are close to each other if ε is small. We do want to preserve this property when we generalise.

Example 3.2. Let $X = \{x, y\}$, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ be defined as $\mu_i(x) = 1 = \mu_i(y)$ and d_i for $i = 1, 2$ is defined as follows:

- $d_i(x, x) = 0 = d_i(y, y)$.
- $d_i(x, y) = l_i$ for some fixed $l \in \mathbb{R}$.



In the GHLP distance, these two metric measure spaces, (X, d, μ_1) and (X, d, μ_2), are close to each other when $|l_1 - l_2|$ is small. We do want to preserve this property when we generalise.

In addition to these two things we want two more crucial ingredients to understand how to generalise. Look at the following slightly different variants of the above two examples.

Example 3.3. Let $X = \{x, y\}$, $d_1 = d_2 = d$ where d is defined as follows:

- $d(x, x) = 0 = d(y, y)$.
- $d(x, y) = \infty$.

Let μ_1 and μ_2 be measures on X given by $\mu_1(x) = 1$, $\mu_1(y) = 0$, $\mu_2(x) = 1$ and $\mu_2(y) = \varepsilon$. We want the two distance measure spaces, (X, d, μ_1) and (X, d, μ_2), to be close to each other when ε is small, in the generalised GHLP distance.

Example 3.4. Let $X = \{x, y\}$, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ be defined as $\mu_i(x) = 1 = \mu_i(y)$ and d_i for $i = 1, 2$ is defined as follows:

- $d_i(x, x) = 0 = d_i(y, y)$.
- $d_1(x, y) = L$ for some fixed $L \in \mathbb{R}$.
- $d_2(x, y) = \infty$.

We want the two distance measure spaces, (X, d, μ_1) and (X, d, μ_2), to be close to each other when L is large, in the generalised GHLP distance.

Now we give the precise definition of the generalised GHLP distance.

Definition 3.5 (L–isometric embedding)**.** A map $i : (M, d, \mu) \to (N, d', \nu)$ is called an L–isometric embedding if $d'(f(x), f(y)) = d(x, y)$ whenever $\min\{d'(f(x), f(y)), d(x, y)\} < L$.

Definition 3.6 (L–isometric ε–embedding)**.** A map from a distance measure space (M, d, μ) to a distance space (N, d'), $i : (M, d, \mu) \to (N, d')$, is called an L–isometric ε–embedding if there exits $E \subset M$ such that $\mu(E) \leq \varepsilon$ and $i : (M \setminus E) \to N$ is an L–isometric embedding.

Definition 3.7 (Generalised GHLP distance, d_ρ)**.** Consider L-isometric ε-embeddings $\iota_i : X_i \to Z, i = 1, 2$ of the spaces X_i into a distance space Z. These give rise to push forward measures $(\iota_i)_*(\mu_i)$ on Z. The distance between the distance measure spaces is the infimum of an appropriate distance between the push forward measures over all L–isometric ε–embeddings, namely,

$$d_\rho = \inf \left\{ d_\pi((\iota_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_2)_*(\mu_2)) + \frac{1}{L} + \varepsilon \mid \ \iota_i : X_i \to Z \text{ an } L\text{-isometric } \varepsilon\text{-embedding} \right\}$$

where Z varies over all metric spaces, $L \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$.

As remarked after the definition of GHLP distance, we can assume that, $Z = \iota_1(X_1) \cup \iota_2(X_2)$.

Lemma 3.8. *If $d_\rho((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) = c$ then, $|\mu_1(X_1) - \mu_2(X_2)| \leq c$*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then, for every space Z and every L-isometric ε-embedding $\iota_i : X_i \to Z$, if we denote $\nu_i = (\iota_i)_*(\mu_i)$ then,

$$|\nu_1(Z) - \nu_2(Z)| = |\mu_1(X_1) - \mu_2(X_2)| > c.$$

Thus, $d_\pi(\nu_1, \nu_2) > c$ and hence $d_\rho((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) > c$. A contradiction. □

From the definition of d_ρ we have

Lemma 3.9. *Let (X, d) and (X', d') be two distance spaces and let $f : (X, d) \hookrightarrow (X', d')$ be an isometric embedding. If μ is a measure on (X, d) and μ' is a measure on X', then,*

$$d_\pi^{(X',d')}(f_*(\mu), \mu') \geq d_\rho((X, d, \mu), (X', d', \mu')).$$

3.2. **Gluing and maximal metric.** A wonderful exposition of the ideas in this section, with more details, can be found in [BBI01].

3.2.1. *Gluing.* Let (X, d) be a metric space and let R be an equivalence relation on X. The quotient semi-distance (a generalisation of distance, allowing distance between unequal points to be zero) d_R is defined as

$$d_R(x, y) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} d(p_i, q_i) : p_1 = x, q_k = y, k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

where the infimum is taken over all choices of $\{p_i\}$ and $\{q_i\}$ such that q_i is R-equivalent to p_{i+1} for all $i = 1, ..., k - 1$. We associate with the semi-distance space, (X, d_R), the distance space $(X/d_R, d_R)$ by identifying points with zero d_R-distance. Given two distance spaces (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) we can define a distance on the union $X \cup Y$ as follows:

- For x, x' in X, $d_{X\cup Y}(x, x') = d_X(x, x')$.
- For y, y' in Y, $d_{X\cup Y}(y, y') = d_Y(y, y')$.
- If $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$,$d_{X\cup Y}(x, y) = \infty$.

If we have a bijection $I : X' \to Y'$ between subsets X' and Y', consider the equivalence relation R on $Z = X \cup Y$ generated by the relations $x \sim y$ if $y = I(x)$. The result of gluing X and Y along I by definition is the quotient space $(Z/d_R, d_R)$.

3.2.2. *Maximal metric.* Let $b : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ be an arbitrary function. Consider the class D of all semi-distances d on X such that $d \leq b$, that is, $d(x, y) \leq b(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Then D has a unique maximal semi-distance d_m such that $d_m \geq d$ for all $d \in D$, given by

$$d_m(x, y) = sup\{d(x, y) : d \in D\}.$$

Thus, given a set X covered by a collection of subsets $\{X_\alpha\}$ each carrying a semi-distance d_α, consider the class of semi-distance D of all semi-distances d, such that $d(x, y) \leq d_\alpha(x, y)$ whenever $x, y \in X_\alpha$. Then there is a unique maximal semi-distance $d_m \in D$.

Theorem 3.1.27 in [BBI01] tells us that the distance as a result of gluing X and Y along I is the maximal metric on $(X \cup Y, d_{X\cup Y})$, denoted as d_I, such that

- For all $z, z' \in X \cup Y$, $d(x, x') \leq d_{X\cup Y}(z, z')$.
- $d(x, I(x)) = 0$.

We can generalise this concept a bit. Given two distance spaces (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) and a function $I : X' \to Y'$ between subsets X' and Y', such that $d_X(x, x') < \delta$ if $I(x) = I(x')$, we can consider the maximal metric, denoted by d_I^δ, such that

- For all $z, z' \in X \cup Y$, $d(x, x') \leq d_{X\cup Y}(z, z')$.
- $d(x, I(x)) \leq \delta$.

Theorem 3.10. *Let R be the equivalence relation generated by the relations $x \sim y$ if $y = I(x)$. The maximal distance $d_I^\delta = \inf\left\{\sum_{i=1}^k d_{X\cup Y}(p_i, q_i) + (k-1)\delta : p_1 = x, q_k = y, k \in \mathbb{N}\right\} =: d_s$ where the infimum is taken over all choices of $\{p_i\}$ and $\{q_i\}$ such that q_i is R-equivalent to p_{i+1} for all $i = 1, ..., k-1$.*

Proof. Let D denote the class of semi-distances satisfying

- For all $z, z' \in X \cup Y$, $d(z, z') \leq d_{X\cup Y}(z, z')$.
- For all $x \in X'$, $d(x, I(x)) \leq \delta$.

As, $d_{X\cup Y}(z, z')$ and $d_{X\cup Y}(x, x) + d_{X\cup Y}(I(x), I(x)) + \delta$ belong to the set over which the infimum is taken, $d_s \in D$. So, it suffices to prove that $d_s \geq d$ for any semi-distance $d \in D$. Let $x, y \in X \cup Y$ and $\{p_i\}$ and $\{q_i\}$ be as defined. Then by the triangle inequality

$$d(x, y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} d(p_i, q_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} d(q_i, p_i + 1)$$

Note that, $p_{i+1} = I(q_i)$ or $q_i = I(p_{i+1})$ or $I(q_i) = I(p_{i+1})$. But, both $d(q_i, I(q_i))$ and $d(I(p_{i+i}), p_{i+1})$ are less than or equal to δ. And if $I(q_i) = I(p_{i+1})$,

$$d(q_i, p_{i+1}) \leq d_{X\cup Y}(q_i, p_{i+1}) \leq d_X(q_i, p_{i+1}) \leq \delta.$$

Hence,

$$d(x, y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_{X\cup Y}(p_i, q_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \delta,$$

that is, $d \leq d_s$. □

Theorem 3.11. *If $|d_X(x,y) - d_Y(I(x),I(y))| \leq \delta$ for all $x, y \in X$, then the inclusions $i_X : (X, d_X) \to (X \cup Y, d_I^\delta)$ and $i_Y(Y, d_Y) \to (X \cup Y, d_I^\delta)$ are isometries.*

Proof. Let R be the equivalence relation generated by the relations $x \sim y$ if $y = I(x)$. Let $\{p_i\}$ and $\{q_i\}$ be such that q_i is R-equivalent to p_{i+1}. Using previous theorem, without loss of generality we can assume that, if p_i belongs to X, then q_i belongs to X as well, because, otherwise $d_{X\cup Y}(p_i, q_i) = \infty$. Similarly, we can assume that, if p_i belongs to Y, then q_i belongs to Y. So, k is odd.

Case 1: Both $x, x' \in X$ (that is, $p_1, q_k \in X$) and $p_2 \in Y$. Then, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(p_2,q_2) + \delta &= d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(I(q_1),I(p_3)) + \delta \\ &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(q_1,p_3) - \delta + \delta \\ &= d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(q_1,p_3) \\ &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,p_3) \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,p_3) + d_{X\cup Y}(p_3,q_3) \geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_3).$$

Therefore, by induction, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_{X\cup Y}(p_i,q_i) + (k-1)\delta &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_k) + \frac{(k-1)\delta}{2} \\ &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_k) = d_X(x,x'). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: Both $x, x' \in X$, that is, $p_1, q_k \in X$ and, $p_2 \in X$. Then,

$$d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(p_2,q_2) \geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_2)$$

So, we are in Case 1 or Case 2 again, with lesser number of terms. Therefore by induction and Case 1 we have the result.

Case 3. Both $y, y' \in Y$, that is $p_1, q_k \in Y$ and $p_2 \in X$. Then, observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(p_2,q_2) + \delta &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,I(p_2)) + d_{X\cup Y}(p_2,q_2) + \delta \\ &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,I(p_2)) + d_{X\cup Y}(I(p_2),I(q_2)) - \delta + \delta \\ &= d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,I(p_2)) + d_{X\cup Y}(I(p_2),I(q_2)) \\ &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,I(q_2)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,I(q_2)) + d_{X\cup Y}(I(q_2),q_3) \geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_3).$$

Therefore, by induction, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_{X\cup Y}(p_i,q_i) + (k-1)\delta &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_k) + \frac{(k-1)\delta}{2} \\ &\geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1,q_k) = d_X(y,y'). \end{aligned}$$

Case 4: Both $y, y' \in Y$, that is $p_1, q_k \in Y$ and $p_2 \in Y$. Then,

$$d_{X\cup Y}(p_1, q_1) + d_{X\cup Y}(p_2, q_2) \geq d_{X\cup Y}(p_1, q_2).$$

So, we are in Case 3 or Case 4 again, with lesser number of terms. Therefore by induction and Case 3 we have the result.

□

We continue to use the same notation as above.

Theorem 3.12. *If I is an L-isometric embedding then so are the inclusion maps $i_X : (X, d_X) \to \left(X \cup Y, d_I^\delta\right)$ and $i_Y : (Y, d_Y) \to \left(X \cup Y, d_I^\delta\right)$ for all $\delta \geq 0$.*

Proof. If $x, x' \in X$ are such that $d_X(x, x') < L$, then $d_Y(I(x), I(y)) = d_X(x, y)$. Therefore, $|d_Y(I(x), I(y)) - d_X(x, y)| = 0 < \delta$. Hence, by the same arguments as in Theorem 3.2.2 we have $d_I^\delta(x, x') = d_X(x, x')$. Similarly, if $y, y' \in Y$ and $d_Y(y, y') < L$, then $d_I^\delta(y, y') = d_Y(y, y')$. □

3.3. **Triangle inequality.** We can now prove triangle inequality for d_ρ by the arguments similar to the one in [GK13] for the Gromov-Hausdorff-Prokhorov distance. Let (X_1, d_1, μ_1), (X_2, d_2, μ_2) and (Y, d_Y, ν) be distance measure spaces. Then,

Theorem 3.13 (Triangle Inequality)**.**

$$d_\rho((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, \mu_2)) \leq d_\rho((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (Y, d_Y, \nu)) + d_\rho((X_2, d_2, \mu_2), (Y, d_Y, \nu))$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. By definition, for $i = 1, 2$ we can find spaces Z_i and maps f_i and g_i such that $f_i : X_i \to Z_i, g_i : Y \to Z_i$ are L_i-isometric ε_i-embeddings and $Z_i = f_i(X_i) \cup g_i(Y)$ and $d_\pi((f_i)_*(\mu_i), (g_i)_*(\nu)) + \frac{1}{L_i} + \varepsilon_i \leq d_\rho(X_i, Y) + \varepsilon$. Now let Z be the distance space obtained from $Z_1 \sqcup Z_2$ by identifying $g_1(y)$ with $g_2(y)$ for all $y \in Y$, and the distance the maximal distance as defined in Section 3.2.2. Denote the inclusion from Z_i to Z by ι_i. Then, $\iota_i \circ f_i : X_i \to Z$ are $min\{L_1, L_2\}$-isometric $max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$-embeddings by Theorem 3.12.

$$d_\rho(X_1, X_2) \leq d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ f_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_2 \circ f_2)_*(\mu_2)) + max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\} + max\left\{\frac{1}{L_1}, \frac{1}{L_2}\right\}$$

By triangle inequality for d_π,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ f_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_2 \circ f_2)_*(\mu_2)) &\leq d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ f_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_1 \circ g_1)_*(\nu)) + d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ g_1)_*(\nu), (\iota_2 \circ f_2)_*(\mu_2)) \\
&\leq d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ f_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_1 \circ g_1)_*(\nu)) + d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ g_1)_*(\nu), (\iota_2 \circ g_2)_*(\nu)) \\
&\quad + d_\pi^Z((\iota_2 \circ g_2)_*(\nu), (\iota_2 \circ f_2)_*(\mu_2)) \\
&\leq d_\pi^{Z_1}((f_1)_*(\mu_1), (g_1)_*(\nu)) + d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ g_1)_*(\nu), (\iota_2 \circ g_2)_*(\nu)) \\
&\quad + d_\pi^{Z_2}((g_2)_*(\nu), (f_2)_*(\mu_2)) \\
&\leq d_\pi^{Z_1}((f_1)_*(\mu_1), (g_1)_*(\nu)) + (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) + d_\pi^{Z_2}((g_2)_*(\nu), (f_2)_*(\mu_2)) \\
&\quad (g_i \text{ is an } \varepsilon_i\text{-embedding.}) \\
&\leq d_\pi^{Z_1}((f_1)_*(\mu_1), (g_1)_*(\nu)) + 2\varepsilon + d_\pi^{Z_2}((g_2)_*(\nu), (f_2)_*(\mu_2))
\end{aligned}$$

We also have $max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\} \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$ and $max\left\{\frac{1}{L_1}, \frac{1}{L_2}\right\} \leq \frac{1}{L_1} + \frac{1}{L_2}$. Thus by the inequalities

$$d_\pi^{Z_i}((f_i)_*(\mu_i), (g_i)_*(\nu)) + \varepsilon_i + \frac{1}{L_i} \leq d_\rho(X_i, Y) + \varepsilon$$

we have,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\pi^Z((\iota_1 \circ f_1)_*(\mu_1), (\iota_2 \circ f_2)_*(\mu_2)) + max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\} + max\left\{\frac{1}{L_1}, \frac{1}{L_2}\right\} &\leq d_\pi^{Z_1}((f_1)_*(\mu_1), (g_1)_*(\nu)) \\ &\quad + d_\pi^{Z_2}((g_2)_*(\nu), (f_2)_*(\mu_2)) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \frac{1}{L_1} + \frac{1}{L_2} + 2\varepsilon \\ &\leq d_\rho(X_1, Y) + d_\rho(X_2, Y) + 4\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary the result follows. □

3.4. **Quasi-isometry between nearby spaces.**

Theorem 3.14. *Given spaces (X, d_X, μ) and (Y, d_Y, ν) such that $d_\rho((X, d_X, \mu), (Y, d_Y, \nu)) < \delta < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, there exists*

- *a subset $\widehat{X} \subset X$ of measure less than δ,*
- *a function $f : (X \setminus \widehat{X}) \to Y$ such that $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < d_X(x, x') + 2\delta$ and $d_X(x, x') < d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + 2\delta$ for all x, x' such that $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ or $d_X(x, x') < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$*
- *for all $E \subset Y$, $\mu(f^{-1}(E)) \leq \nu(E^{2\delta}) + 2\delta$ and $\nu(E) \leq \mu(f^{-1}(E)^{2\delta}) + 2\delta$,*
- *$\nu(Y) \leq \nu(f(X \setminus \widehat{X})^{2\delta}) + 2\delta$*

Further we have,

- *$\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta} \subset f^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta}\right)$*
- *If $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$, $\nu(E) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}(E^{2\delta})\right) + 2\delta$.*

Proof. The proof of this theorem will take nearly the whole of this subsection. To summarize, we will construct a set $\widehat{X}$ and a function $f : (X \setminus \widehat{X}) \to Y$ and show that it satisfies all the properties.

Note that as $d_\rho(X, Y) < \delta$, there exists a metric space (Z, d) and L-isometric ε-embeddings $\varphi : X \to Z$ and $\psi : Y \to Z$ such that

$$d_\pi(\varphi_*(\mu), \psi_*(\nu)) + \frac{1}{L} + \varepsilon < \delta_1 := \left(\frac{d_\rho(X, Y) + \delta}{2}\right) < \delta.$$

Thus, $\frac{1}{L}$ and ε are both less than δ. For all $x \in X, d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y))$ is attained for some point $y \in Y$ as $\psi(Y)$ is closed. Define $f(x)$ to be one such y. Note that, except for the set $\widehat{X} = \{x \in X : d(\phi(x), \psi(Y)) > \delta\}$, of measure less than δ, $d(\varphi(x), \psi(f(x))) = d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y)) < \delta$. So, even though the choice of $f(x)$ is not unique, any two choices are not farther than 2δ from each other.

Lemma 3.15. *If $\delta_2 = \frac{\delta - \delta_1}{2} = \frac{\delta - d_\rho(X,Y)}{4}$ then, $\mu\left(\left(\widehat{X}\right)^{\delta_2}\right) \leq \delta_1$.*

Proof. Note that, as $x \in \left(\widehat{X}\right)^{\delta_2}$, there exists $x' \in \widehat{X}$ such that $d_X(x, x') < \delta_2 < \delta < \frac{1}{\delta}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &< d(\varphi(x'), \psi(Y)) \leq d(\varphi(x'), \varphi(x)) + d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y)) \\ &= d_X(x, x') + d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y)) \\ &= \delta_2 + d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y)).\end{aligned}$$

That is, $d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y)) > \delta - \delta_2 = \frac{\delta+\delta_1}{2} > \delta_1$. As $x \in \left(\widehat{X}\right)^{\delta_2}$ was arbitrary we get, $\left(\widehat{X}\right)^{\delta_2} \subset \{x \in X : d(\varphi(x), \psi(Y)) > \delta - \delta_2\} =: S$. Note that as $d_\pi(\varphi_*(\mu), \psi_*(\nu)) + \frac{1}{L} + \varepsilon < \delta_1$, $d_\pi(\varphi_*(\mu), \psi_*(\nu)) < \delta_1$. That is $\mu\left(\left(\widehat{X}\right)^{\delta_2}\right) \leq \mu(S) = \varphi_*(\mu)(\varphi(S)) \leq \psi_*(\nu)\left(S^{\delta_1}\right) + \delta_1 = \delta_1$. □

Lemma 3.15 will be used in the proof of Proposition 3.33.

Lemma 3.16. *For all x, x' such that $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ or $d_X(x, x') < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ we have $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < d_X(x, x') + 2\delta$ and $d_X(x, x') < d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + 2\delta$.*

Proof. As $\frac{1}{L} < \delta$, that is, $\frac{1}{\delta} < L$, $d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) = d_X(x, x')$ for all $x, x' \notin \widehat{X}$ with $d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) < \frac{1}{\delta}$ or $d_X(x, x') < \frac{1}{\delta}$. We have, $\frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta < L$, therefore, $d_X(x, x') < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ implies that $d(\phi(x), \phi(x')) = d_X(x, x')$. Thus, $d(\phi(x), \phi(x')) \leq \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$. So,

$$d(\psi(f(x)), \psi(f(x'))) \leq d(\psi(f(x)), \varphi(x)) + d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) + d(\varphi(x'), \psi(f(x'))) \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$$

Similarly we can prove that if $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ then, $d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) < \frac{1}{\delta}$. Hence, for all $x, x' \notin \widehat{X}$ with $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ or $d_X(x, x') < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$;

$$\begin{aligned}d_Y(f(x), f(x')) &= d(\psi(f(x)), \psi(f(x'))) \\ &\leq d(\psi(f(x)), \varphi(x)) + d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) + d(\varphi(x'), \psi(f(x'))) \\ &< \delta + d_X(x, x') + \delta = d_X(x, x') + 2\delta.\end{aligned}$$

If $f(x) \neq f(x')$ then,

$$\begin{aligned}d_X(x, x') &= d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) \\ &\leq d(\varphi(x), \psi(f(x))) + d(\psi(f(x)), \psi(f(x'))) + d(\psi(f(x')), \varphi(x')) \\ &< \delta + d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + \delta = d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + 2\delta.\end{aligned}$$

If $f(x) = f(x')$ then

$$\begin{aligned}d_X(x, x') &= d(\varphi(x), \varphi(x')) \\ &\leq d(\varphi(x), \psi(f(x))) + d(\psi(f(x')), \varphi(x')) \\ &< 2\delta = d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + 2\delta.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.17. *For all $E \subset Y$, $\mu(f^{-1}(E)) \leq \nu(E^{2\delta}) + 2\delta$ and $\nu(E) \leq \mu(f^{-1}(E)^{2\delta}) + 2\delta$*

Proof. For all $E \subset Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(f^{-1}(E)) &\leq \varphi_*(\mu)(\varphi(f^{-1}(E))) + \varepsilon : \quad (\text{as } \varphi \text{ is an } \varepsilon\text{-embedding}) \\
&\leq \varphi_*(\mu)((\psi(E))^{\delta}) + \varepsilon : \quad \left(\text{as } \varphi(f^{-1}(E)) \subset \psi(E)\right) \\
&\leq \psi_*(\nu)((\psi(E))^{2\delta}) + \varepsilon + \delta \ : (\text{as } d_\pi(\varphi_*(\mu), \psi_*(\nu)) < \delta) \\
&\leq \nu\left(\psi^{-1}\left((\psi(E))^{2\delta}\right)\right) + \varepsilon + \delta
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $x \in \psi^{-1}\left((\psi(E))^{2\delta}\right)$ implies that $\psi(x) \in (\psi(E))^{2\delta}$ that is, $d(\psi(x), \psi(E)) < 2\delta$. As ψ is an L-isometric ε-embedding with $L > \frac{1}{\delta} > 2\delta$, $x \in E^{2\delta}$. Thus, $\psi^{-1}\left((\psi(E))^{2\delta}\right) \subset E^{2\delta}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(f^{-1}(E)) &\leq \nu\left(\psi^{-1}\left((\psi(E))^{2\delta}\right)\right) + \varepsilon + \delta \\
&\leq \nu(E^{2\delta}) + \delta + \varepsilon \\
&\leq \nu(E^{2\delta}) + 2\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\forall E \subset Y$,

$$\nu(E) \leq \psi_*(\nu)\left(\left(\varphi\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)\right)^{\delta}\right) + \varepsilon \leq \varphi_*(\mu)\left(\left(\varphi\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)\right)^{2\delta}\right) + \varepsilon + \delta \leq \mu\left(\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta}\right) + 2\delta.$$

□

Lemma 3.18. $\nu(Y) \leq \nu(f(X \setminus \widehat{X})^{2\delta}) + 2\delta$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(Y) &\leq \delta + \psi_*(\nu)(Z) = \delta + \psi_*(\nu)\left(Z \setminus \left(\varphi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{\delta}\right)\right) + \psi_*(\nu)\left(\phi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{\delta}\right) \\
&\leq \delta + \varphi_*(\mu)\left(\left(Z \setminus \left(\varphi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{\delta}\right)\right)^{\delta}\right) + \delta + \psi_*(\nu)\left(\varphi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{\delta}\right) \\
&\leq \delta + 0 + \delta + \psi_*(\nu)\left(\varphi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{\delta}\right) = \psi_*(\nu)\left(\varphi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{\delta}\right) + 2\delta \\
&\leq \psi_*(\nu)\left(\psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{2\delta}\right) + 2\delta \left\{\text{as } \varphi\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right) \subset \psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{\delta}\right\} \\
&\leq \nu\left(\psi^{-1}\left(\psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{2\delta}\right)\right) + 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.19. $\psi^{-1}\left(\psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{2\delta}\right) \subset f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{2\delta}$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \psi^{-1}\left(\psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{2\delta}\right) &\implies \psi(x) \in \psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{2\delta} \\
&\implies \exists y \in f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right) \ s.t\ d(\psi(x), \psi(y)) < 2\delta < \frac{1}{\delta} \\
&\implies d_Y(x, y) = d(\psi(x), \psi(y)) < 2\delta \\
&\implies x \in f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{2\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

As $x \in \psi^{-1}(\psi(f(X \setminus \widehat{X}))^{2\delta})$ was arbitrary, $\psi^{-1}(\psi(f(X \setminus \widehat{X}))^{2\delta}) \subset f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{2\delta}$. □

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(Y) &\leq \nu\left(\psi^{-1}\left(\psi\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)\right)^{2\delta}\right)\right) + 2\delta \\ &\leq \nu\left(f\left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right)^{2\delta}\right) + 2\delta.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.20. *We have* $\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta} \subset f^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta}\right)$.

Proof. Let $x \in \left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta}$. Then, there exists $y \in X$ such that $d_X(x,y) < 2\delta < \frac{1}{\delta} - 2\delta$ and $f(y) \in E$. So, $d_Y(f(x), f(y)) < d_X(x,y) + 2\delta$, that is, $f(x) \in E^{2\delta}$. Hence, $x \in f^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta}\right)$. As $x \in \left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta}$ was arbitrary $\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta} \subset f^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta}\right)$. □

Lemma 3.21. *If* $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$, $\nu(E) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}(E^{2\delta})\right) + 2\delta$.

Proof. We already saw that $\nu(E) \leq \mu\left(\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta}\right) + 2\delta$. But, by Lemma 3.20 $\mu\left(\left(f^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta}\right) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta}\right)\right)$. So, $\nu(E) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta}\right)\right) + 2\delta$. □

Thus, we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.14 by proving all the necessary properties for the set $\widehat{X}$ and the function $f : (X \setminus \widehat{X}) \to Y$ we constructed. □

From the proof of Theorem 3.14 the following lemma is clear.

Lemma 3.22. *Let* $d_\rho(X,Y) < \delta$. *Construct maps* $f : \left(X \setminus \widehat{X}\right) \to Y$ *and* $g : \left(Y \setminus \widehat{Y}\right) \to X$ *as in Theorem 3.14. Then for* $x, y \in X \setminus \left(\widehat{X} \cup f^{-1}\left(\widehat{Y}\right)\right)$ *with* $d_X(x,y) < \frac{1}{\delta} - 4\delta$,

$$d_X(x,y) - 4\delta \leq d_X(g \circ f(x), g \circ f(y)) \leq d_X(x,y) + 4\delta.$$

Further, $\mu\left(f^{-1}\left(\widehat{Y}\right)\right) \leq \nu\left(\widehat{Y}^{2\delta}\right) + 2\delta$.

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 3.23. *Let* $d_\rho(X^n, X)$ *converge to zero. Construct maps* $f^n : \left(X^n \setminus \widehat{X^n}\right) \to X$ *and* $g^n : \left(X \setminus \widehat{X^n}\right) \to X^n$ *as in Theorem 3.14. Define* $X' = X/\sim$ *where* $\sim$ *is defined as* $x \sim y$ *if* $f^n \circ g^n(x) = f^n \circ g^n(y)$ *for infinitely many n. Then* $d_\rho(X^n, X')$ *converges to zero.*

3.5. **Positivity of the distance.** As the definition of d_ρ ignores, for example, isolated points of measure zero, we do not expect $d_\rho((X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, u_2)) = 0$ to imply that there is a measure preserving isometry between the two, but only that it is true up to ignoring an appropriate class of sets with measure zero.

Theorem 3.24. *Given two complete separable distance measure spaces* $(X, d_X, \mu), (Y, d_Y, \nu)$, *we have* $d_\rho((X, d_X, \mu), (Y, d_Y, \nu)) = 0$ *if and only if there are open sets* $U \subset X$ *and* $V \subset Y$, *of zero measure, so that there is a measure preserving isometry between* $(X \setminus U, d_X|_{X\setminus U}, \mu)$ *and* $(Y \setminus V, d_Y|_{Y\setminus V}, \nu)$.

Proof. The proof of this theorem will take the whole of this subsection. To summarize, for each $\frac{1}{n^2}$ we construct a quasi-isometry from a subset of X to Y as in Theorem 3.14 and take the limit as n tends to infinity. We will prove that such a limit exists and it is a measure preserving isometry from X to Y.

For each n the inequality $d_\rho((X, d_X, \mu), (Y, d_Y, \nu)) < \frac{1}{n^2}$ gives a map from $f_n : X \setminus X^n \to Y$ as in Theorem 3.14. Let $X_n = X \setminus X^n$. Then $(X_n, d|_{X_n} = d_n, \mu|_{X_n} = \mu_n)$ converges to (X, d_X, μ). We shall construct a map $f : X \to Y$ which is the limit of the maps $f_n : X_n \to Y$. If $X(k) = \cup_{i=k}^{\infty} X^i$, $\mu(X(k)) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2}$ which goes to zero as k goes to infinity. Thus $\mu(\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} X(k)) = 0$. Denote $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} X(k)$ by $\underline{X}$. For any point $x \in X \setminus \underline{X}$, x is in the domain of all but finitely many n's.

Lemma 3.25. *Given $x \in X \setminus \underline{X}$, the infinite sequence $f_n(x)$ has a convergent subsequence.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then there exists an ε_1 such that

$$d_Y(f_n(x), f_m(x)) \geq \varepsilon_1$$

for all n, m. Choose $\varepsilon < \min\left(\left\{\left(n^2 - \frac{2}{n^2}\right), \left(\varepsilon_1 - \frac{4}{n^2}\right) : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}\right)$. The terms $\frac{2}{n^2}$ and $\frac{4}{n^2}$ goes to zero as n goes to infinity, and the terms $\left(n^2 - \frac{2}{n^2}\right)$ and $\left(\varepsilon_1 - \frac{4}{n^2}\right)$ increases with n. Hence the minimum exists. By using Theorem 3.14, we have for all n such that the terms $\left(n^2 - \frac{2}{n^2}\right)$ and $\left(\varepsilon_1 - \frac{4}{n^2}\right)$ are positive (i.e for all but finitely many n),

$$f_n(B(x, \varepsilon)) \subset B\left(f_n(x), \varepsilon + \frac{2}{n^2}\right).$$

Thus,

$$(f_n(B(x, \varepsilon)))^{\frac{2}{n^2}} \subset B\left(f_n(x), \varepsilon + \frac{2}{n^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n^2}}.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(B\left(f_n(x), \varepsilon + \frac{2}{n^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n^2}}) &\geq \nu((f_n(B(x, \varepsilon)))^{\frac{2}{n^2}}) \\ &\geq \mu(B(x, \varepsilon)) - \frac{2}{n^2} \\ &\qquad \text{(apply Theorem 3.14).} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $(B(f_n(x), \varepsilon + \frac{2}{n^2}))^{\frac{2}{n^2}}$ are disjoint. This contradicts with the assumption that Y has finite measure. □

Choose a countable dense subset $S = \{x_1, x_2, ...\} \subset (X \setminus \underline{X})$. Choose a subsequence $f_{n_{1,k}}$ of f_n such that $f_{n_{1,k}}(x_1)$ converges. We choose a further subsequence $f_{n_{2,k}}$ of $f_{n_{1,k}}$ such that $f_{n_{2,k}}(x_2)$ converges. Observe that $f_{n_{2,k}}(x_1)$ continues to converge. Iterating this process, we obtain subsequences $f_{n_{j,k}}$ so that $f_{n_{j,k}}(x_l)$ converges for $l \leq j$. It follows that for the diagonal sequence $f_{n_{k,k}}$ we have the corresponding convergence for all points in S. Replace f_n by this diagonal subsequence. Define

$$f(x_i) = \lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x_i)$$

Lemma 3.26. $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) \leq d_X(x_i, x_j)$.

Proof. Given x_i and x_j, if $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) = \infty = d_X(x_i, x_j)$, then it is obvious. Otherwise, choose n so large that $\min\{d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)), d_X(x_i, x_j)\} < n^2 - \frac{2}{n^2}$. Then,

$$d_Y(f_n(x_i), f_n(x_j)) \leq d_X(x_i, x_j) + \frac{2}{n^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} d_Y(f_n(x_i), f_n(x_j)) \\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} d_X(x_i, x_j) + \frac{2}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\frac{2}{n^2}$ tends to zero as n tends to infinity we have the result. □

Lemma 3.27. $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) \geq d_X(x_i, x_j)$.

Proof. Given x_i and x_j, if $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) = \infty = d_X(x_i, x_j)$, then it is obvious. Otherwise, choose n so large that $\min\{d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)), d_X(x_i, x_j)\} < n^2 - \frac{2}{n^2}$. Then,

$$d_Y(f_n(x_i), f_n(x_j)) \geq d_X(x_i, x_j) - \frac{2}{n^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} d_Y(f_n(x_i), f_n(x_j)) \\ &\geq \lim_{n\to\infty} d_X(x_i, x_j) - \frac{2}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\frac{2}{n^2}$ tends to zero as n tends to infinity we have the result. □

From Lemma 3.26 and Lemma 3.27 we have

Lemma 3.28. *The map f is an isometry on S.*

As S is dense in $X \setminus \underline{X}$ given any point $X \setminus \underline{X}$ there exist a sequence $s_n \in S$ such that $d_X(s_n, x)$ tends to 0. Define $f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(s_n)$ where s_n tends to x as n tends to ∞.

The map f is well defined: Let $\langle s_n\rangle_n$ and $\langle t_n\rangle_n$ be two sequence which converge to x. Then the sequence $s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2, ...$ is Cauchy and so is the sequence $f(s_1), f(t_1), f(s_2), f(t_2), ...$ by Lemma 3.28. Thus it converges and has the same limit as $\langle f(s_n)\rangle_n$ and $\langle f(t_n)\rangle_n$. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(s_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(t_n)$.

The map f is an isometry: Given two points $x, x' \in X \setminus \underline{X}$ consider sequences $\langle s_n\rangle_n \subset S$ and $\langle t_n\rangle_n \subset S$ such that s_n converges to x and t_n converges to x'. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x), f(x')) &\leq d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(s_n), f(t_n)) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')) \\ &\leq d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_X(s_n, t_n) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $d_Y(f(s_n), f(t_n)) \leq d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x'))$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x), f(x')) &\geq d_Y(f(s_n), f(t_n)) - (d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')) \\ &= d_X(s_n, t_n) - (d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')). \end{aligned}$$

As $d_Y(f(x), f(s_n))$, $d_Y(f(t_n), f(x'))$ tends to zero and $d_X(s_n, t_n)$ tends to $d_X(x, x')$ we have the result.

Extend f: Let U be the interior of $\underline{X}$. Clearly $\mu(U) \leq \mu(\underline{X}) = 0$. Extend f to $X \setminus U$ as follows. Given any point in $x \in X \setminus U$ there exists a sequence of points $x_n \in X \setminus \underline{X}$ such that x_n converges to x. Define $f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(x_n)$. This is well defined as f is an isometry on $X \setminus \underline{X}$. U is an open set. So, $X \setminus U$ is closed. Let $y_n \in f(X \setminus U)$ and y_n converges to y. If $y_n = f(x_n)$, f is an isometry and y_n converges imply that x_n converges to some point x. This $x \in X \setminus U$ as $X \setminus U$ is closed. So, $y \in f(X \setminus U)$. Thus, $f(X \setminus U)$ is closed. Let $V = Y \setminus (f(X \setminus U))$. Then V is open.

The map f preserves measure: Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N(\varepsilon)$, $\left(f^{-1}(E)\right) \subset f_n^{-1}(E^\varepsilon)$. Thus, for all $n \geq N(\varepsilon)$,

$$\mu\left(f^{-1}(E)\right) \leq \mu\left(f_n^{-1}\left(E^\varepsilon\right)\right) \leq \nu\left(E^{\varepsilon+\frac{2}{n^2}}\right) + \frac{2}{n^2}.$$

Let C be a closed set in Y. We have for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mu\left(f^{-1}(C)\right) \leq \nu\left(C^{\varepsilon+\frac{2}{n^2}}\right) + \frac{2}{n^2}$. Fix an ε and choose n so large that $\frac{2}{n^2} < \varepsilon$. We have $\mu\left(f^{-1}(C)\right) \leq \nu\left(C^{2\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon$. As C is a closed set, given any open set U containing C, there exists a number ε such that $C^\varepsilon \subset U$. Using the fact that $\nu(C) = \inf\{\nu(U) : U \text{ is an open set containing } C\} = \inf\{\nu(C^\varepsilon) : \varepsilon > 0\}$ we have, $\mu\left(f^{-1}(C)\right) \leq \nu(C)$. μ, ν are regular measures and f satisfies $\mu\left(f^{-1}(C)\right) \leq \nu(C)$ for all closed sets imply that $\mu\left(f^{-1}(E)\right) \leq \nu(E)$ for all sets.

Lemma 3.29. $\nu(f(X \setminus U)) = \nu(Y)$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(Y) &\leq \nu\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{2}{n^2}}\right) + \frac{2}{n^2} \\ &\leq \mu\left(f_n^{-1}\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right)\right) + \frac{4}{n^2} \text{ \{by Lemma 3.21\}}\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.30. $f_n^{-1}\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right) \subset \left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}x \in f_n^{-1}\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right) &\implies f_n(x) \in f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}} \\ &\implies \exists y \in X \setminus X^n \; s.t \; d_Y(f_n(x), f_n(y)) < \frac{4}{n^2} < n^2 - \frac{2}{n^2} (\forall n \geq 2)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $d_X(x, y) = d_Y(f_n(x), f_n(y)) < \frac{4}{n^2}$, that is, $x \in \left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}$. As $x \in f_n^{-1}\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right)$ was arbitrary, $f_n^{-1}\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right) \subset \left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}$. □

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(Y) &\leq \mu\left(f_n^{-1}\left(f_n\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right)\right) + \frac{4}{n^2} \\ &\leq \mu\left(\left(X \setminus X^n\right)^{\frac{4}{n^2}}\right) + \frac{4}{n^2} \\ &\leq \mu(X) + \frac{4}{n^2}\end{aligned}$$

As the inequality $\nu(Y) \leq \mu(X) + \frac{4}{n^2}$ holds for every n, $\nu(Y) \leq \mu(X)$. On the other hand the inequality $\mu(f^{-1}(E)) \leq \nu(E)$ gives,

$$\nu(Y) \leq \mu(X) = \mu(X \setminus U) \leq \mu(f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U))) \leq \nu(f(X \setminus U)).$$

Also, $\nu(f(X \setminus U)) \leq \nu(Y)$ as $f(X \setminus U) \subset Y$. So, $\nu(f(X \setminus U)) = \nu(Y)$. □

Lemma 3.31. *If E is any set in Y, then,*

$$\mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((E \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) + \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((E \cap V)^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Proof. Now, $\nu(E) \leq \mu\left(f_n^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}}\right)\right) + \frac{2}{n^2}$ by Lemma 3.21. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $N(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N(\varepsilon)$, $f_n^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}}\right) \subset f^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right)$. Thus,

$$\nu(E) \leq \mu\left(f_n^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}}\right)\right) + \frac{2}{n^2} \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right)\right) + \frac{2}{n^2}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right) &= f^{-1}\left(((E \cap (Y \setminus V)) \cup (E \cap V))^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= f^{-1}\left((E \cap (Y \setminus V))^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon} \cup (E \cap V)^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\subset f^{-1}\left((E \cap (Y \setminus V))^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right) \cup f^{-1}\left((E \cap V)^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right)\right) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((E \cap (Y \setminus V))^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right)\right) + \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((E \cap V)^{\frac{2}{n^2}+\varepsilon}\right)\right)$. Fix an ε and choose n so large that $\frac{2}{n^2} < \varepsilon$. Then,

$$\mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((E \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) + \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((E \cap V)^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

□

Let C be a closed set in Y. As C is a closed set and V is an open set, $C \cap V$ is closed. So, for sufficiently small ε, $(C \cap V)^{2\varepsilon} \subset V$. So, $\mu\left(f^{-1}\left((C \cap V)^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) = 0$, that is, $\mu\left(f^{-1}\left(C^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right)$. Observe that,

Lemma 3.32. $f^{-1}\left((C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right) \subset \left(f^{-1}(C)\right)^{2\varepsilon}$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} x \in f^{-1}\left((C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right) &\implies f(x) \in (C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon} \\ &\implies f(x) \in (C \cap (f(X \setminus U)))^{2\varepsilon} \\ &\implies \exists y \in X \setminus U \text{ s.t } f(y) \in C \text{ and } D(f(x), f(y)) < 2\varepsilon \\ &\implies x \in \left(f^{-1}(C)\right)^{2\varepsilon} \{f \text{ is an isometry}\}. \end{aligned}$$

As $x \in f^{-1}\left((C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right)$ was arbitrary, $f^{-1}\left((C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right) \subset \left(f^{-1}(C)\right)^{2\varepsilon}$. □

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(E) &\leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(C^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) + 2\varepsilon \\ &\leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left((C \cap (Y \setminus V))^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) + 2\varepsilon \\ &\leq \mu\left(\left(f^{-1}(C)\right)^{2\varepsilon}\right) + 2\varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

Note that C is closed implies that $f^{-1}(C)$ is also closed. Using the fact that $\mu(f^{-1}(C)) = \inf\left\{\mu(U) : U \text{ is an open set containing } f^{-1}(C)\right\} = \inf\left\{\mu\left(\left(f^{-1}(C)\right)^{\varepsilon}\right) : \varepsilon > 0\right\}$ we have,

$$\mu(f^{-1}(C)) \geq \nu(C).$$

Hence, $\mu(f^{-1}(C)) = \nu(C)$ for every closed set C. As μ, ν are regular measures and f preserves the measure of every closed set, f is measure preserving.

Thus, the function $f : X \to Y$ is a measure preserving isometry. So, we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.24. □

3.6. **Limit map between limit spaces.**

Proposition 3.33. *Let $(X, d_X, \mu), (Y, d_Y, \nu)$ be complete separable distance measure spaces. Let $(X^n, d_{X^n}, \mu^n), (Y^n, d_{Y^n}, \nu^n)$ be such that, $d_\rho(X^n, X)$ converges to 0 and $d_\rho(Y^n, Y)$ converges to 0. Given measure preserving isometries $f^n : X^n \to Y^n$ we can construct a measure preserving isometry $f : X \setminus \underline{X} \to Y$ where $\underline{X} \subset X$ is a set of measure zero.*

Proof. This proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition 3.24. Again, the proof of this theorem will take the whole of this subsection. To summarize, we construct maps $\varphi^n : \left(Y^n \setminus \widetilde{Y^n}\right) \to Y$ and $\psi^n : \left(X \setminus \widehat{X^n}\right) \to X^n$ as in Theorem 3.14 and take the limit of $\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x)$ as n tends to infinity. We will prove that such a limit exists, it is a measure preserving isometry from $X \setminus \underline{X}$ (for some set $\underline{X}$ we define) to Y, and $\underline{X}$ has measure zero.

As $d_\rho(Y^n, Y)$ converges to 0, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\delta_2^n = d_\rho(Y^n, Y) < \frac{1}{n^2}$. As $d_\rho(X^n, X)$ converges to 0, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\delta_1^n = d_\rho(X^n, X) < \frac{\frac{1}{n^2} - \delta_2^n}{4}$. First construct maps $\varphi^n : \left(Y^n \setminus \widetilde{Y^n}\right) \to Y$ and $\psi^n : \left(X \setminus \widehat{X^n}\right) \to X^n$, as in Theorem 3.14. Let $X(k) = \cup_{i=k}^{\infty} \widehat{X^i}$, $Y(k) = \cup_{i=k}^{\infty} (\psi^n)^{-1}\left((f^n)^{-1}\left(\widetilde{Y^n}\right)\right)$ and $\underline{X} = \left[\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} X(k)\right] \cup \left[\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} Y(k)\right]$.

Lemma 3.34. $\mu(\underline{X}) = 0$.

Proof. Note that, $\mu(X(k)) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2}$ which goes to zero as k goes to infinity. Thus, the measure $\mu\left(\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} X(k)\right) = 0$. On the other hand, the following computation shows that the

measures $\mu(Y(k))$ goes to zero as k goes to infinity.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(Y(k)) &\leq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \mu\left((\psi^k)^{-1}\left((f^k)^{-1}\left(\widetilde{Y^k}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \mu^k\left(\left((f^k)^{-1}\left(\widetilde{Y^k}\right)\right)^{\frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4}}\right) + \frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4} \quad \{Theorem 3.14\} \\
&= \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \mu^k\left((f^k)^{-1}\left(\left(\widetilde{Y^k}\right)^{\frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4}}\right)\right) + \frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4} \quad \{f^k \text{ is an isometry}\} \\
&= \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \nu^k\left(\left(\widetilde{Y^k}\right)^{\frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4}}\right) + \frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4} \quad \{f \text{ is measure preserving}\} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \frac{\frac{1}{k^2}+\delta_2^k}{2} + \frac{\frac{1}{k^2}-\delta_2^k}{4} \quad \{Lemma 3.15\} \\
&= \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \frac{\frac{3}{k^2}+\delta_2^k}{4} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

goes to zero as k goes to infinity. Thus $\mu\left(\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} Y(k)\right) = 0$. Hence $\mu(\underline{X}) = 0$. □

Lemma 3.35. *Given a point $x \in (X \setminus \underline{X})$, the infinite sequence $\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x)$ has a convergent subsequence.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then there exists an ε_1 such that

$$d_Y\left(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x), \varphi^m \circ f^m \circ \psi^m(x)\right) \geq \varepsilon_1$$

Choose $\varepsilon < \min\left(\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\delta_1^n} - 2\delta_1^n\right), \left(\frac{1}{\delta_2^n} - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n\right), \left(\varepsilon_1 - 4\delta_1^n - 4\delta_2^n\right) : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}\right)$. As n goes to infinity, δ_i^n goes to zero and the terms $\left(\frac{1}{\delta_1^n} - 2\delta_1^n\right)$,$\left(\frac{1}{\delta_2^n} - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n\right)$,$\left(\varepsilon_1 - 4\delta_1^n - 4\delta_2^n\right)$ becomes bigger and bigger. Hence the minimum exists. By using Theorem 3.14 twice, we have for all n such that all the three terms $\left(\frac{1}{\delta_1^n} - 2\delta_1^n\right)$,$\left(\frac{1}{\delta_2^n} - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n\right)$, $\left(\varepsilon_1 - 4\delta_1^n - 4\delta_2^n\right)$ are positive (i.e for all but finitely many n),

$$\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(B(x, \varepsilon)) \subset B(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x), \varepsilon + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n).$$

Thus,

$$(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(B(x, \varepsilon)))^{2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n} \subset (B(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x), \varepsilon + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n))^{2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n}.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu((B(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x), \varepsilon + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n))^{2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n}) &\geq \nu((\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(B(x, \varepsilon)))^{2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n}) \\
&\geq \mu(B(x, \varepsilon)) - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n \\
&\quad \text{(apply Theorem 3.14 twice).}
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $(B(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x), \varepsilon + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n))^{2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n}$ are disjoint. This contradicts with the assumption that Y has finite measure. □

Choose a countable dense subset $S = \{x_1, x_2, ...\} \subset (X \setminus \underline{X})$. Choose a subsequence $\varphi^{n_{1,k}} \circ f^{n_{1,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{1,k}}$ of $\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n$ such that $\varphi^{n_{1,k}} \circ f^{n_{1,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{1,k}}(x_1)$ converges. We choose a further subsequence $\varphi^{n_{2,k}} \circ f^{n_{2,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{2,k}}$ of $\varphi^{n_{1,k}} \circ f^{n_{1,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{1,k}}$ such that $\varphi^{n_{2,k}} \circ f^{n_{2,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{2,k}}(x_2)$ converges. Observe that $\varphi^{n_{2,k}} \circ f^{n_{2,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{2,k}}(x_1)$ continues to converge. Iterating this process, we obtain subsequences $\varphi^{n_{j,k}} \circ f^{n_{j,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{j,k}}$ so that $\varphi^{n_{j,k}} \circ f^{n_{j,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{j,k}}(x_l)$ converges for $l \leq j$. It follows that for the diagonal sequence $\varphi^{n_{k,k}} \circ f^{n_{k,k}} \circ \psi^{n_{k,k}}$ we have the corresponding convergence for all points in S. Replace $\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n$ by this diagonal subsequence. Define

$$f(x_i) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i)$$

Lemma 3.36. $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) \leq d_X(x_i, x_j)$.

Proof. Given x_i and x_j, if $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) = \infty = d_X(x_i, x_j)$, then it is obvious. Otherwise, choose n so large that $\min\{d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)), d_X(x_i, x_j)\} < \min\left\{\frac{1}{\delta_1^n}, \frac{1}{\delta_2^n}\right\} - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i), \varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_j)) &\leq d_{Y^n}(f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i), f^n \circ \psi^n(x_j)) + 2\delta_2^n \\ &= d_{X^n}(\psi^n(x_i), \psi^n(x_j)) + 2\delta_2^n \\ &\leq d_X(x_i, x_j) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} d_Y(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i), \varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_j)) \\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} d_X(x_i, x_j) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n. \end{aligned}$$

As δ_i^n tends to zero as n tends to infinity we have the result. □

Lemma 3.37. $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) \geq d_X(x_i, x_j)$.

Proof. Given x_i and x_j, if $d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) = \infty = d_X(x_i, x_j)$, then it is obvious. Otherwise, choose n so large that $\min\{d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)), d_X(x_i, x_j)\} < \min\left\{\frac{1}{\delta_1^n}, \frac{1}{\delta_2^n}\right\} - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i), \varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_j)) &\geq d_{Y^n}(f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i), f^n \circ \psi^n(x_j)) - 2\delta_2^n \\ &= d_{X^n}(\psi^n(x_i), \psi^n(x_j)) - 2\delta_2^n \\ &\geq d_X(x_i, x_j) - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x_i), f(x_j)) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} d_Y(\varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_i), \varphi^n \circ f^n \circ \psi^n(x_j)) \\ &\geq \lim_{n\to\infty} d_X(x_i, x_j) - 2\delta_1^n - 2\delta_2^n. \end{aligned}$$

As δ_i^n tends to zero as n tends to infinity we have the result. □

From Lemma 3.36 and Lemma 3.37 we have

Lemma 3.38. *The map f is an isometry on S.*

As S is dense in $X \setminus \underline{X}$ given any point $X \setminus \underline{X}$ there exist a sequence $s_n \in S$ such that $d(s_n, x)$ tends to 0. Define $f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(s_n)$ where s_n tends to x as n tends to ∞.

The map f is well defined: Let $\langle s_n\rangle_n$ and $\langle t_n\rangle_n$ be two sequence which converge to x. Then the sequence $s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2, ...$ is Cauchy and so is the sequence $f(s_1), f(t_1), f(s_2), f(t_2), ...$ by Lemma 3.38. Thus it converges and has the same limit as $\langle f(s_n)\rangle_n$ and $\langle f(t_n)\rangle_n$. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(s_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(t_n)$.

The map f is an isometry: Given two points $x, x' \in X \setminus \underline{X}$ consider sequences $\langle s_n\rangle_n \subset S$ and $\langle t_n\rangle_n \subset S$ such that s_n converges to x and t_n converges to x'. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x), f(x')) &\leq d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(s_n), f(t_n)) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')) \\ &\leq d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_X(s_n, t_n) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $d_Y(f(s_n), f(t_n)) \leq d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(x), f(x')) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x'))$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x), f(x')) &\geq d_Y(f(s_n), f(t_n)) - (d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')) \\ &= d_X(s_n, t_n) - (d_Y(f(x), f(s_n)) + d_Y(f(t_n), f(x')). \end{aligned}$$

As $d_Y(f(x), f(s_n))$, $d_Y(f(t_n), f(x'))$ tends to zero and $d_X(s_n, t_n)$ tends to $d_X(x, x')$ we have the result.

The map f preserves measure:

Lemma 3.39. *If $A \subset Y$, $\mu\left(f^{-1}(A)\right) \leq \nu\left(A^{\varepsilon+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n$.*

Proof. If $E \subset Y$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1} \circ (\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right) &\leq \mu^n\left(((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1}(E))^{2\delta_2^n}\right) + 2\delta_2^n \\ &\leq \mu^n\left((f^n)^{-1}\left(\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right) + 2\delta_2^n \\ &\quad \text{(as } f^n \text{ is an isometry)} \\ &\leq \nu^n\left(\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n}\right) + 2\delta_2^n \\ &\quad \text{(as } f^n \text{ is measure preserving)} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that,

Lemma 3.40. $\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n} \subset (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)$.

Proof. $x \in \left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n}$ means that $d_{Y^n}(x, (\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)) < 2\delta_2^n$, that is, there exists $y \in X$ such that $\varphi^n(y) \in E$ and $d_{Y^n}(x, y) < 2\delta_2^n$. If n is large enough so that $\delta_2^n < \frac{1}{2}$ then, $d_{Y^n}(x, y) < 2\delta_2^n < \frac{1}{\delta_2^n} - 2\delta_2^n$. So, $d_Y(\varphi^n(x), \varphi^n(y)) < d_{Y^n}(x, y) + 2\delta_2^n$. Thus, $x \in (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)$. As $x \in \left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n}$ was arbitrary, $\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n} \subset (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)$. □

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1}\circ(f^n)^{-1}\circ(\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right) &\leq \nu^n\left(\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}(E)\right)^{2\delta_2^n}\right)+2\delta_2^n\\ &\leq \nu^n\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)+2\delta_2^n\\ &\leq \nu\left(E^{2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n.\end{aligned}$$

Let $A\subset Y$ be arbitrary, given $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $N(\varepsilon)$ such that, $f^{-1}(A)$ is contained in $(\psi^n)^{-1}\circ(f^n)^{-1}\circ(\varphi^n)^{-1}(A^\varepsilon)$ for all $n\geq N(\varepsilon)$. Thus,

$$\mu(f^{-1}(A))\leq\mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1}\circ(f^n)^{-1}\circ(\varphi^n)^{-1}(A^\varepsilon)\right)$$

Replacing E by A^ε in the previous computation we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(f^{-1}(A))&\leq\mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1}\circ(f^n)^{-1}\circ(\varphi^n)^{-1}(A^\varepsilon)\right)\\ &\leq\nu\left(A^{\varepsilon+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.41. *If C be a closed set in Y, $\mu(f^{-1}(C))\leq\nu(C)$.*

Proof. Let C be a closed set in Y. We have for all $\varepsilon>0,\mu(f^{-1}(C))\leq\nu\left(C^{\varepsilon+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n$. Fix an ε and choose n so large that $2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n<\varepsilon$. We have $\mu(f^{-1}(C))\leq\nu\left(C^{2\varepsilon}\right)+\varepsilon$. As C is a closed set, given any open set U containing C, there exists a number ε such that $C^\varepsilon\subset U$. Using the fact that $\mu(C)=\inf\{\mu(U):U\text{ is an open set containing }C\}=\inf\{\mu(C^\varepsilon):\varepsilon>0\}$ we have, $\mu(f^{-1}(C))\leq\nu(C)$. □

Similarly,

Lemma 3.42. *If $E\subset Y$, $\nu(E)\leq\mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{\varepsilon+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n$.*

Proof. If $E\subset Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(E)&\leq\nu^n\left((\phi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)+2\delta_2^n\\ &\quad\text{(by Lemma 3.21)}\\ &\leq\mu^n\left((f^n)^{-1}\circ(\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)+2\delta_2^n\\ &\quad\text{(as } f\text{ is measure preserving)}\\ &\leq\mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1}\left(\left((f^n)^{-1}\circ(\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n}\right)\right)+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n\\ &\quad\text{(by Lemma 3.21)}\\ &\leq\mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1}\circ(f^n)^{-1}\left(\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n}\right)\right)+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n\\ &\quad\text{(as } f\text{ is an isometry)}\end{aligned}$$

Observe that,

Lemma 3.43. $\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n}\subset(\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n+2\delta_1^n}\right)$.

Proof. A point $x \in \left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n}$ means that $d_{Y^n}\left(x, (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right) < 2\delta_1^n$, that is, there exists $y \in Y^n$ such that $\varphi^n(y) \in E^{2\delta_2^n}$ and $d_{Y^n}(x,y) < 2\delta_1^n$. If n is large enough so that $\delta_1^n < \frac{1}{2}$ then, $d_{Y^n}(x,y) < 2\delta_1^n < \frac{1}{\delta_1^n} - 2\delta_1^n$. So, $d_Y(\varphi^n(x), \varphi^n(y)) < d_{Y^n}(x,y) + 2\delta_1^n$. Thus, $x \in (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)^{2\delta_1^n}\right) \subset (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n+2\delta_1^n}\right)$. As $x \in \left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n}$ was arbitrary, we have $\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n} \subset (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n+2\delta_1^n}\right)$. □

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(E) &\leq \mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1}\left(\left((\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_2^n}\right)\right)^{2\delta_1^n}\right)\right) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n \\ &\leq \mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1} \circ (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)\right) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n.\end{aligned}$$

Let $A \subset Y$ be arbitrary, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\varepsilon)$ such that, $(\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1} \circ (\varphi^n)^{-1}(A)$ is contained in $f^{-1}(A^\varepsilon)$ for all $n \geq N(\varepsilon)$. Thus,

$$\mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1} \circ (\varphi^n)^{-1}(A)\right) \leq \mu(f^{-1}(A^\varepsilon)).$$

Using this inequality for $A = E^{2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(E) &\leq \mu\left((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ (f^n)^{-1} \circ (\varphi^n)^{-1}\left(E^{2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)\right) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n \\ &\leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(E^{\varepsilon+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)\right) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.44. *If C be a closed set in Y, $\mu(f^{-1}(C)) \geq \nu(C)$.*

Proof. Let C be a closed set in Y. We have for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\nu(C) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(C^{\varepsilon+2\delta_1^n+2\delta_2^n}\right)\right) + 2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n$. Fix an ε and choose n so large that $2\delta_1^n + 2\delta_2^n < \varepsilon$. Then, $\nu(C) \leq \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(C^{2\varepsilon}\right)\right) + \varepsilon$. As C is a closed set, given any open set U containing C, there exists a number ε such that $C^\varepsilon \subset U$. Using the fact that $\mu(C) = \inf\{\mu(U) : U \text{ is an open set containing } C\} = \inf\{\mu(C^\varepsilon) : \varepsilon > 0\}$ we have, $\mu\left(f^{-1}(C)\right) \geq \nu(C)$. □

Thus, for every closed set C, $\mu\left(f^{-1}(C)\right) = \nu(C)$. As μ, ν are regular measures and f preserves the measure of every closed set, f is measure preserving.

Thus we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.33 by showing that the set $\underline{X}$ has zero measure and $f : X \setminus \underline{X} \to Y$ is a measure preserving isometry.

□

3.7. **Approximating a distance measure space by a finite distance measure space.** In this subsection we will prove that any complete separable distance measure space (X, d, μ), with finite measure, can be approximated by a finite distance measure space, i.e., by (Y, d', ν) where Y is a finite set.

Theorem 3.45. *If X is a complete separable distance (metric) space and μ a finite measure on X. Then given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a compact set K_ε such that $\mu((K_\varepsilon)^C) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a countable dense set. Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\frac{1}{k}}(x_i) = X$. Thus for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ you can find $N(k)$ such that $U_k = \cup_{i=1}^{N(k)} B_{\frac{1}{k}}(x_i)$ has measure at least $M - \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k}$ (where

$M = \mu(X)$). The set $U_\varepsilon = \cap_1^\infty U_k$ is a totally bounded set as $U_\varepsilon \subset \cup_{i=1}^{N(k)} B_\delta(x_i)$ if, $\delta > \frac{1}{k}$. Hence its closure, K_ε, is compact. Also, $\mu\left((K_\varepsilon)^C\right) \leq \mu\left(\cup_1^\infty U_k^C\right) = \sum_1^\infty \mu\left(U_k^C\right) \leq \sum_1^\infty \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k} = \varepsilon$. □

Theorem 3.46. *Given a complete separable distance (metric) measure space (X, d, μ) such that μ is finite, we can find another measure μ_ε such that μ_ε is supported on a finite set and $d_\pi(\mu, \mu_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Using Theorem 3.45 we get a compact set K_ε such that $\mu\left(K_\varepsilon^C\right) \leq \varepsilon$. Consider the open cover $\{B(x, \varepsilon) \mid x \in K_\varepsilon\}$ of K_ε. This has a finite sub cover as, K_ε is compact. Take the centres of the corresponding balls to get a finite set X_ε. Let $X_\varepsilon = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$. Define the atomic measure μ_ε inductively. Define

$$\mu_\varepsilon(x_1) = \mu\left(B_\varepsilon(x_1)\right)$$

Given $\mu_\varepsilon(x_i), \forall i < k$ define

$$\mu_\varepsilon(x_k) = \mu\left(B_\varepsilon(x_k) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{k-1} B_\varepsilon(x_i)\right)$$

1. $\mu_\varepsilon(E) \leq \mu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$.

$$\mu_\varepsilon(E) = \mu_\varepsilon(E \cap X_\varepsilon) \leq \mu(E^\varepsilon) \leq \mu(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$$

The first equality follows from the definition of μ_ε. The second inequality follows because for each x_i, $\mu_\varepsilon(x_i) \leq \mu(\{x_i\}^\varepsilon)$.

2. $\mu(E) \leq \mu_\varepsilon(E^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. The set E^ε contains all x_i such that $B(x_i, \varepsilon) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. So, $\mu_\varepsilon(E^\varepsilon) \geq \mu(\cup_{i \text{ s.t } B(x_i,\varepsilon)\cap E\neq\emptyset} B(x_i, \varepsilon))$. As $K_\varepsilon \cap E \subset \cup_{i \text{ s.t } B(x_i,\varepsilon)\cap E\neq\emptyset} B(x_i, \varepsilon)$, $\mu\left(\cup_{i \text{ s.t } B(x_i,\varepsilon)\cap E\neq\emptyset} B(x_i, \varepsilon)\right) \geq \mu(K_\varepsilon \cap E))$ which is greater than or equal to $\mu(E) - \varepsilon$ as, $\mu((K_\varepsilon)^C) \leq \varepsilon$.

Thus we have proved that $d_\pi(\mu_\varepsilon, \mu) \leq \varepsilon$.

□

Theorem 3.47. *Given a complete separable distance (metric) measure space (X, d, μ) such that μ is finite, we can find another finite distance (metric) measure, i.e., has only finitely many points, such that, $(X_\varepsilon, d', \mu_\varepsilon)$ such that*

$$d_\rho((X, d, \mu), (X_\varepsilon, d', \mu_\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Choose X_ε and μ_ε as in the proof of theorem 3.46 and let $d' = d$. Then we have that

$$d_\rho((X, d, \mu), (X_\varepsilon, d', \mu_\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

□

3.8. **Space of finite distance measure spaces with bounded total measure and bounded number of points is compact.**

Theorem 3.48. *Let $\mathcal{F}(N, M)$ be the space of finite distance measure spaces with total measure less than or equal to M and number of points less than or equal to N. Then, $\mathcal{F}(N, M)$ is compact.*

Proof. We will show compactness by showing that any sequence has a convergent subsequence. Let $\langle (X_n, d_n, \mu_n)\rangle_n$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{F}(N, M)$. Then, there are infinitely many X_n with same cardinality. So, without loss of generality we can assume that all X_n have same cardinality. So, let $X_n = \{x_1, ..., x_n\} = X$. The sequence $\langle d_n(x_i, x_j)\rangle_n$ is contained in $[0, \infty]$ hence , has a convergent subsequence. Choose a subsequence, $(X_{n_k}, d_{n_k}, \mu_{n_k})$, of the (X_n, d_n, μ_n) such that, $d_{n_k}(x_i, x_j)$ converges as k tends to infinity, for all i, j.

Define Y to be the set $X/\sim$, where $\sim$ is the equivalence relation defined as, $x \sim y$ if $d_{n_k}(x, y)$ converge to zero. Define a distance d on Y as $d([x], [y]) = \lim_{k\to\infty} d_{n_k}(x, y)$. Finally define a measure μ on Y as $\mu([x]) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\sum_{y\sim x} \mu_{n_k}(x)\right)$.

It is clear that $(X_{n_k}, d_{n_k}, \mu_{n_k})$ converges to $(Y, d, \mu))$ as k tends to infinity. As the sequence (X_n, d_n, μ_n) was arbitrary, $\mathcal{F}(N, M)$ is compact. □

3.9. **Completeness of the space of distance measure spaces.**

Lemma 3.49. *Let (X_n, d_n, μ_n) be a Cauchy sequence. For all m, let (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m) be a finite distance measure space such that $d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_n, d_n, \mu_n)) \leq \frac{1}{2^m}$. Then (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m) has uniformly bounded total measure for all m.*

Proof. The proof of this theorem will take this entire subsection. To summarize, we will first approximate each X_n by a finite space. Giving us a Cauchy sequence of finite distance measure spaces. Take its limit. We will do this for better and better approximations (closer than $\frac{1}{2^m}$) and will take the limit of the sequence of limiting finite spaces, as m tends to infinity. Finally, we will complete this space to obtain the space X and show that X_n converge to X.

As the sequence $\langle (X_n, d_n, \mu_n)\rangle_n$ is Cauchy, so is the sequence $\langle (X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m)\rangle_n$. Hence, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\varepsilon)$, such that $d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_{N(\varepsilon)}^m, d_{N(\varepsilon)}^m, \mu_{N(\varepsilon)}^m)) < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq N(\varepsilon)$. Then, by Lemma 3.8, $\mu_n^m(X_n^m) \leq \mu_{N(\varepsilon)}^m(X_{N(\varepsilon)}^m) + \varepsilon$ □

Theorem 3.50. *Let (X, d) be a separable distance space and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the space of all borel measures on X. (X, d) is complete if and only if $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_\pi)$ is complete.*

Proof. Apply the corresponding theorem for metric spaces to each equivalence class of $\sim$. See [Par05] or [vG03] for more details. □

Let $\mathfrak{X}$ the quotient of the set of all complete separable distance measure spaces with the equivalence relation $X \sim Y$ if and only if $d_\rho(X, Y) = 0$.

Theorem 3.51. *$\mathfrak{X}$ is complete.*

Proof. Consider a Cauchy sequence (X_n, d_n, μ_n). Using Theorem 3.47 for each n, we obtain a sequence (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m) such that $d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_n, d_n, \mu_n)) \leq \frac{1}{2^m}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $X_n^m \supset X_n^{m-1}$ as otherwise we can replace X_n^m by $X_n^m \cup X_n^{m-1}$ and then define μ_n^{k+1} as in the proof of Theorem 3.46 on this set. By Lemma 3.49 for each m we have that, (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m) has bounded total measure. We will prove that we can choose X_n^m, such that there is a uniform bound (not dependent on n) on the cardinality as well.

Lemma 3.52. *For each m, we can choose X_n^m, such that there is an upper bound on the cardinality of X_n^m which does not depend on n.*

Proof. Choose an $N(m)$ such that $d_\rho((X_n, d_n, \mu_n), (X_k, d_k, \mu_k)) < \frac{1}{2^{m+3}}$, for all $n \geq N(m)$. Thus, there exists a metric space (Z, d) and L-isometric ε-embeddings $f_1 : (X_{N(m)}, d_{N(m)}) \to (Z, d)$

and $f_2 : (X_k, d_k) \to (Z, d)$ such that the push-forward measures $\nu_{N(m)} = (f_1)_*(\mu_{N(m)})$ and $\nu_k = (f_2)_*(\mu_k)$ satisfy $d_\pi(\nu_{N(m)}, \nu_k) + \frac{1}{L} + \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+3}}$. So, $d_\pi(\nu_{N(m)}, \nu_k) \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+3}}$.

Let $X^{m+2}_{N(m)} = \{x_1, ..., x_M\}$. For each i such that $f_2(X_k) \cap B\left(f_1(x_i), \frac{1}{2^{m+2}}\right) \neq \emptyset$, let $z_i \in X_k$ be an arbitrary point such that $f_2(z_i) \in B\left(f_1(x_i), \frac{1}{2^{m+2}}\right)$ and define

$$\widehat{X^m_k} = \left\{ z_i \mid i \ s.t \ f_2(X_k) \cap B\left(f_1(x_i), \frac{1}{2^{m+2}}\right) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.53. $\mu_k\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right) \geq \mu_k(X_k) - \frac{1}{2^m}$.

Proof. The proof is a series of simple computations. First observe that,

Lemma 3.54. $\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}} \cap f_2(X_k) \subset f_2\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)$.

Proof. If $y \in \left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}} \cap f_2(X_k)$ then there exists $x \in X_k$ such that $y = f_2(x)$ and there exists $x' \in \widehat{X^m_k}$ such that $\frac{1}{2^m} > d(f_2(x'), y) = d(f_2(x'), f_2(x))$. As $L > \frac{1}{2^m}$, $d_k(x, x') = d(f_2(x), f_2(x')) < \frac{1}{2^m}$. So, $y \in f_2\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)$. As $y \in \left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}} \cap f_2(X_k)$ was arbitrary, $\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}} \cap f_2(X_k) \subset f_2\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)$. □

Thus, we have, $\mu_k\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right) \geq \nu_k\left(f_2\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)\right) \geq \nu_k\left(\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}} \cap f_2(X_k)\right)$. Further, $\nu_k\left(\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}} \cap f_2(X_k)\right) = \nu_k\left(\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)$ as $\nu_k(E) = \nu_k(E \cap f_2(X_k))$.

Lemma 3.55. *Given a set $A \subset Z$ and real numbers a and b, $(A^a)^b \subset A^{a+b}$.*

Proof. Given a set A and real numbers a and b, $x \in (A^a)^b$ implies $\exists x_1 \in A^a$ such that $d(x, x_1) < b$ which implies that $\exists x_2 \in A$ such that $d(x_1, x_2) < a$. Thus, $d(x, x_2) \leq d(x, x_1) + d(x_1, x_2) \leq a + b$. So, $x \in A^{a+b}$. As, $x \in (A^a)^b$ was arbitrary, we have $(A^a)^b \subset A^{a+b}$. □

Hence, $\nu_k\left(\left(\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right) \leq \nu_k\left(\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right) \leq \mu_k\left(\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)$.

Lemma 3.56. $\left(f_1\left(X^{m+2}_{N(m)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}} \cap f_2(X_k) \subset \left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}$.

Proof. If $z \in \left(f_1\left(X^{m+2}_{N(m)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}} \cap f_2(X_k)$ there exists an i such that $d(z, f_1(x_i)) < \frac{1}{2^{m+2}}$. So, $f_2(X_k) \cap B\left(f_1(x_i), \frac{1}{2^{m+2}}\right) \neq \emptyset$. The distance $d(z, f_2(z_i)) \leq d(z, f_1(x_i)) + d(f_1(x_i), f_2(z_i)) \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+2}} + \frac{1}{2^{m+2}} = \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}$. So, $z \in \left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}$. As, $z \in \left(f_1\left(X^{m+2}_{N(m)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}} \cap f_2(X_k)$ was arbitrary, $\left(f_1\left(X^{m+2}_{N(m)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}} \cap f_2(X_k) \subset \left(f_2\left(\widehat{X^m_k}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}$. □

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_k\left(\left(\left(f_2\left(\widehat{X_k^m}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right) &\geq \nu_k\left(\left(\left(f_1\left(X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right)\\
&\geq \nu_{N(m)}\left(\left(f_1\left(X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}}\right) - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}} \quad \left(\text{use } d_\pi(\nu_N,\nu_k) \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+3}} \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\right)\\
&\geq \nu_{N(m)}\left(f_1\left(\left(X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}}\right)\right) - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\\
&\quad \left(f_1\left(\left(X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}}\right) \subset \left(f_1\left(X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}} \text{ as } f_1 \text{ is } L\text{-isometric}\right)\\
&\geq \mu_{N(m)}\left(\left(X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+2}}}\right) - \frac{1}{2^{m+3}} - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\\
&\quad \left(\text{use } f_1 \text{ is an } \varepsilon\text{-embedding where } \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+3}}\right)\\
&\geq \mu_{N(m)}(X_{N(m)}) - \frac{1}{2^{m+2}} - \frac{1}{2^{m+3}} - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\\
&\geq \mu_k(X_k) - \frac{1}{2^{m+3}} - \frac{1}{2^{m+3}} - \frac{1}{2^{m+2}} - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\\
&\quad \left(\text{use Lemma 3.8 and } d_\rho(X_{N(m)}, X_k) \leq \frac{1}{2^{m+3}}\right)\\
&\geq \mu_k(X_k) - \frac{1}{2^m}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have proved $\mu_k\left(\left(\widehat{X_k^m}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right) \geq \mu_k(X_k) - \frac{1}{2^m}$. □

Redefine X_n^m to be $\widehat{X_n^m} \cup X_n^{m-1}$. Then, $\left|X_n^m\right| \leq \left|\widehat{X_n^m}\right| + \left|X_n^{m-1}\right|$. So, for $n > \max\{N(m), N(m-1)\}$, $\left|X_n^m\right| \leq \left|X_{N(m)}^{m+2}\right| + \left|X_{N(m-1)}^{m+1}\right|$. Thus, we have constructed X_n^m with bounded cardinality. □

Hence by Theorem 3.48, for each m we have that (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m) converges as n tends to infinity. Denote the limit of (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m) as n tends to ∞ by $(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)$. As $X_n^m \subset X_n^{m+1}$, we have a sequence of isometric embeddings

$$(X_\infty^1, d_\infty^1) \hookrightarrow (X_\infty^2, d_\infty^2) \hookrightarrow \ldots$$

consider the direct limit of this sequence to get a distance measure space $(X_\infty^\infty, d_\infty^\infty)$. Let (X, d) denote the completion of $(X_\infty^\infty, d_\infty^\infty)$. We have isometric embeddings from $(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m) \hookrightarrow (X_\infty^\infty, d_\infty^\infty) \hookrightarrow X$, for each m. Call the isometric embedding $(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m) \hookrightarrow X$, ψ_m. Push forward μ_∞^m to X by ψ_m and call it ν^m.

Lemma 3.57. *The sequence ν^n is Cauchy.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $n < m$. Then, we have inclusions $\psi_n^m : (X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n) \hookrightarrow (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.21 we have,

$$d_\pi^{(X,d)}(\nu_n, \nu_m) = d_\pi^{(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m)}((\psi_n^m)_*(\mu_\infty^n), \mu_\infty^m)$$

The sets X_k^m and X_k^n are subsets of X_k. Viewing μ_k^m and μ_k^n as measures on X_k, we have

$$d_\pi^{(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m)}((\psi_n^m)_*(\mu_\infty^n), \mu_\infty^m) = \lim_{k\to\infty} d_\pi^{(X_k,d_k)}(\mu_k^m, \mu_k^n)$$

Claim: $d_\pi^{(X_k,d_k)}(\mu_k^m, \mu_k^{m+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}$. The measure μ_k^m and μ_k^{m+1} are atomic measure. So, it is enough to check for singleton sets.

If $x \in X_k^m$, then $\mu_k^m(\{x\}) \geq \mu_k^{m+1}(\{x\})$. On the other hand $\mu_k^m(\{x\}) \leq \mu_k\left(B\left(x, \frac{1}{2^m}\right)\right)$ and $B\left(x, \frac{1}{2^m}\right) \subset \left(\cup_{y\in X_k^{m+1}\ s.t\ d_k(x,y)<\frac{1}{2^m}+\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}} B\left(y, \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\right)\right) \cup \left(\left(X_k^{m+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right)^C$. Thus,

$$\mu_k^m(\{x\}) \leq \mu_k^{m+1}\left(\{x\}^{\frac{1}{2^m}+\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right) + \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}.$$

Similarly, if $x \in X_n^{m+1} \setminus X_n^m$, then $\mu_k^{m+1}(\{x\}) \geq \mu_k^m(\{x\})$. On the other hand $\mu_k^{m+1}(\{x\}) \leq \mu_k\left(B\left(x, \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\right)\right)$ and $B\left(x, \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}\right) \subset \left(\cup_{y\in X_k^m\ s.t\ d_k(x,y)<\frac{1}{2^m}+\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}} B\left(y, \frac{1}{2^m}\right)\right) \cup \left(\left(X_k^m\right)^{\frac{1}{2^m}}\right)^C$. Thus,

$$\mu_k^{m+1}(\{x\}) \leq \mu_k^m\left(\{x\}^{\frac{1}{2^m}+\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}\right) + \frac{1}{2^m}.$$

For all other points x, $\mu_n^m(\{x\}) = 0 = \mu_n^{m+1}(\{x\})$. Thus we have the claim. Hence,

$$d_\pi^{(X_k,d_k)}(\mu_k^m, \mu_k^n) \leq \sum_{i=n}^{m}\left(\frac{1}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^{i+1}}\right).$$

So, we have,

$$d_\pi^{(X,d)}(\nu_n, \nu_m) \leq \sum_{i=n}^{m}\left(\frac{1}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^{i+1}}\right).$$

Therefore, ν^n is Cauchy.

□

Further, ν^n converges because, (X, d) is complete implies $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_\pi)$ is complete. Call the limit μ. It is clear from the definition of μ that, $(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)$ converges to (X, d, μ) as m goes to infinity.

We claim that, (X_n, d_n, μ_n) converges to (X, d, μ). We will first prove that the convergence of the sequence (X_n^m, d_n^m, μ_n^m), as n tends to ∞, to $(X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)$ is uniform, in some sense, with respect to m.

Lemma 3.58. *The sequence $(X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n, \mu_\infty^n)$ is Cauchy. In fact,*

$$d_\rho((X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n, \mu_\infty^n), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

Proof. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find an N such that

$$d_\rho((X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n, \mu_\infty^n), (X_k^n, d_k^n, \mu_k^n)) \leq \varepsilon,\ \forall k \geq N.$$

and

$$d_\rho((X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m), (X_k^m, d_k^m, \mu_k^m)) \leq \varepsilon,\ \forall k \geq N.$$

But, $d_\rho((X_k^i, d_k^i, \mu_k^i), (X_k, d_k, \mu_k)) \leq \frac{1}{2^i}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\rho((X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n, \mu_\infty^n), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq\ & d_\rho((X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n, \mu_\infty^n), (X_k^n, d_k^n, \mu_k^n)) \\ & + d_\rho((X_k^n, d_k^n, \mu_k^n), (X_k, d_k, \mu_k)) \\ & + d_\rho((X_k^m, d_k^m, \mu_k^m), (X_k, d_k, \mu_k)) \\ & + d_\rho((X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m), (X_k^m, d_k^m, \mu_k^m)) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $d_\rho((X_\infty^n, d_\infty^n, \mu_\infty^n), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^n} + \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^n} + 2\varepsilon$. As, $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary we have the result. □

Lemma 3.59.

$$d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq d_\rho((X_n^{m'}, d_n^{m'}, \mu_n^{m'}), (X_\infty^{m'}, d_\infty^{m'}, \mu_\infty^{m'})) + 2(\frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^{m'}}).$$

Proof. We have already proved that

$$d_\rho((X_\infty^{m'}, d_\infty^{m'}, \mu_\infty^{m'}), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^{m'}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\rho((X_n^{m'}, d_n^{m'}, \mu_n^{m'}), (X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m)) &\leq d_\rho((X_n^{m'}, d_n^{m'}, \mu_n^{m'}), (X_n, d_n, \mu_n)) \\ &\quad + d_\rho((X_n, d_n, \mu_n), (X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^{m'}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq\ & d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_n^{m'}, d_n^{m'}, \mu_n^{m'})) \\ & + d_\rho((X_n^{m'}, d_n^{m'}, \mu_n^{m'}), (X_\infty^{m'}, d_\infty^{m'}, \mu_\infty^{m'})) \\ & + d_\rho((X_\infty^{m'}, d_\infty^{m'}, \mu_\infty^{m'}), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \\ \leq\ & \left(\frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^{m'}}\right) + d_\rho((X_n^{m'}, d_n^{m'}, \mu_n^{m'}), (X_\infty^{m'}, d_\infty^{m'}, \mu_\infty^{m'})) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^{m'}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

Now to prove (X_n, d_n, μ_n) converges to (X, d, μ). Given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose N such that for all $n \geq N$ we have,

$$d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

and choose m large enough that $\frac{1}{2^m} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ and

$$d_\rho\left((X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m), (X, d, \mu)\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Then for $n \geq N$ and m as described above, we have;

$$\begin{aligned} d_\rho((X_n, d_n, \mu_n), (X, d, \mu)) &\leq d_\rho((X_n, d_n, \mu_n), (X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m)) \\ &\quad + d_\rho((X_n^m, d_n^m, \mu_n^m), (X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m)) \\ &\quad + d_\rho((X_\infty^m, d_\infty^m, \mu_\infty^m), (X, d, \mu)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.51 by proving that (X_n, d_n, μ_n) converges to (X, d, μ).

□

3.10. **A pre-compactness theorem.** Now, we will prove a theorem analogous to the Gromov's compactness theorem for metric spaces, for distance measure spaces.

Theorem 3.60. *Let $\mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,M}$ be a collection of complete separable distance measure spaces with the property that $\mu(X) \leq M$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,M}$. Suppose, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\varepsilon)$ such that, for all $(X, d, \mu) \in \mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,M}$ there exists a set $S_{X,\varepsilon}$ such that $|S_{X,\varepsilon}| \leq N(\varepsilon)$ and $\mu((S_{X,\varepsilon})^\varepsilon)^C) \leq \varepsilon$. Then, $\mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,\mathcal{M}}$ is totally bounded and hence pre-compact.*

Proof. The space of finite distance measure spaces with bounded area and bounded number of points is totally bounded, as it is compact. Thus given any ε we can choose a finite cover of $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ balls for the same. Thus ε balls (centred at the same points) gives a ε sized cover for $\mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,M}$, as, given any $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,M}$ you can choose a finite distance measure space which is at an $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ distance from S. Thus $\mathfrak{X}_{\varepsilon,M}$ is totally bounded. □

Remark 3.61. Consider the sequence $(\{x\}, d(x,x) = 0, \mu_n(x) = n)$. This sequence has no convergent subsequence. This illustrates that the condition of bounded area is necessary. Scaling the Riemannian metric on a fixed surface gives us a similar example with Riemann surfaces.

4. Deligne-Mumford compactification as completion

4.1. **Cusp curves.** Let S be a closed surface and let $(\gamma_i)_{i\in I}$ be a possibly empty family of finitely many smooth simple closed and pairwise disjoint loops in S. Let $\widehat{S}$ be the surface obtained from $S \setminus \cup_i \gamma_i$ by the one point compactification at each end. By s_k' and s_k'', $k \in I$, we denote the two points of $\widehat{S}$ added to $S \setminus \cup_i \gamma_i$ at the two ends which arise from removing γ_k. We now identify s_k' and s_k'' for $k \in I$. In this way we obtain a compact topological space $\overline{S}$. Hence we can obtain $\overline{S}$ from S by collapsing each loop γ_i to a point. By $\alpha : \widehat{S} \to \overline{S}$ we denote the canonical projection. The points $\overline{s_k} := \alpha(s_k')$ are called singular points of the singular surface $\overline{S}$. We denote the set of singular points on $\overline{S}$ by $si(\overline{S})$. Via α the subset $\overline{S} \setminus \{\overline{s_i} \mid i \in I\} \subset \overline{S}$ inherits a differentiable structure. A complex structure $\overline{j}$ on the singular surface $\overline{S}$ is a complex structure on $\widehat{S}$.

4.2. **The space of cusp curves equipped with d_ρ.** Given a Riemann surface S, the metric on S defines an area form on S viz.

$$\sigma_g(v, w) = \left[g(v, v).g(v, w) - g^2(v, w)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, $\mu_g(E) = \int_E \sigma_g$ gives a measure, making (S, g, μ_g) a metric measure space. Thus the generalised GHLP metric gives a (pseudo)metric on the space of Riemann surfaces.

Theorem 4.1. *The generalised Gromov-Hausdorff-Levi-Prokhorov distance, d_ρ, is a metric on the space of Riemann surfaces.*

Proof. Two distance measure spaces $(X_1, d_1, \mu_1), (X_2, d_2, u_2)$ are at zero distance from each other if and only if there are open sets $U_1 \subset X_1$ and $U_2 \subset X_2$, of zero measure, such that there is a measure preserving isometry between $(X_1 \setminus U_1, d_1, \mu_1)$ and $(X_2 \setminus U_2, d_2, \mu_2)$. But, given a Riemannian metric g on a surface S, $\mu_g(U) > 0$ for all open sets $U \subset S$. Thus the result. □

Given a cusp curve, associated to it is the hyperbolic surface $S \setminus si(S)$. Given two cusp curves S_1 and S_2 we define the $d_\rho(S_1, S_2) := d_\rho(S_1 \setminus si(S_1), S_2 \setminus si(S_2))$. This gives a metric on the space of all cusp curves.

4.3. **Fenchel Nielson co-ordinates and d_ρ.** In this section we show that the topology generated by d_ρ is the same as that given by the Fenchel Nielson co-ordinates.

Definition 4.2 (q-quasi-isometry)**.** A homeomorphism $\varphi : X \to Y$ between two metric spaces X and Y is a q-quasi-isometry ($q \geq 1$) or quasi-isometry if

$$\frac{1}{q} d_X(x, y) \leq d_Y(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) \leq q d_X(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

Lemma 4.3. *If R and S are q-quasi-isometric Riemann surfaces then,*

$$d_\rho(R, S) \leq max\left\{\left(1 - \frac{1}{q^2}\right)\mu_R(R), \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^2}\right)\mu_S(S), diam(S)\,(q-1)\right\} =: \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi : R \to S$ be a q-quasi-isometry. Then, $\frac{1}{q^2} \times g|_x \leq g'|_{\varphi(x)} \leq q^2 \times g|x$ where, g and g' denotes the Riemannian metric on R and S respectively. So, $\frac{1}{q^2} \times \sigma_g|_x \leq \sigma_{g'}|_{\varphi(x)} \leq q^2 \times \sigma_g|_x$. Thus, denoting the measures on R and S described above by μ_R and μ_S we have

$$\frac{1}{q^2} \times \mu_S(\varphi(E)) \leq \mu_R(E) \leq q^2 \times \mu_S(\varphi(E)).$$

Define $Z := R \sqcup S$ and let the metric on Z be the maximal metric d_φ^ε defined in Section 3.2.2. As φ is a q-quasi-isometry,

$$d_R(x, y) - d_S(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) \leq d_R(x, y) - \frac{1}{q} d_R(x, y) = d_R(x, y)\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right)$$

and

$$d_S(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) - d_R(x, y) \leq q d_R(x, y) - d_R(x, y) = d_R(x, y)(q - 1).$$

That is,

$$d_R(x, y)(1 - q) \leq d_R(x, y) - d_S(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) \leq d_R(x, y)\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \leq d_R(x, y)(q - 1)$$

Thus, if $\varepsilon \geq diam(S)\,(q-1)$, then by Theorem 3.11 the inclusion $R \hookrightarrow Z$ and $S \hookrightarrow Z$ are isometric 0-embeddings. Thus the inclusions from R and S to Z will give the required result because, given $E \subset Z$, if $\varepsilon' > \varepsilon$;

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_R(E^{\varepsilon'}) + \varepsilon' &\geq \mu_R((E \cap S)^{\varepsilon'}) + \varepsilon' \geq \mu_R(\phi^{-1}(E \cap S)) + \varepsilon' \\ &\geq \frac{1}{q^2}\mu_S(\varphi \circ \varphi^{-1}(E \cap S)) + \varepsilon' \\ &\geq \frac{1}{q^2}\mu_S(E \cap S) + \varepsilon' \\ &= \frac{1}{q^2}\mu_S(E) + \varepsilon' \geq \mu_S(E).\end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_S(E^{\varepsilon'}) + \varepsilon' &\geq \mu_S((E \cap R)^{\varepsilon'}) + \varepsilon' \geq \mu_S(\phi(E \cap R)) + \varepsilon' \\ &\geq \frac{1}{q^2}\mu_R(E \cap R) + \varepsilon' \\ &= \frac{1}{q^2}\mu_R(E) + \varepsilon' \geq \mu_R(E).\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon' > \varepsilon$ was arbitrary, we have the result. □

Chapter 3 of [Bus10] describes construction of quasi-isometries between two non degenerate pair of pants and quasi isometry while gluing pair of pants. So, all that remains is the case of degenerate pair of pants.

Lemma 4.4. *Let H_1, H_2 be the hexagons with sides (b_1, b_2, b_3) and $(b_1, 0, b_3)$. Then the distance $d_\rho(H_1, H_2)$ is small if b_2 is small*

Proof. The two hexagons can be embedded in $\mathbb{H}$ as shown below



The hexagon shaded in the picture on the left is H_1 and on the right is H_2. The distance $d_\rho(H_1, H_2)$ is clearly less than the area of $(H_1 \cup H_2) - (H_1 \cap H_2)$, the symmetric difference.



Using the notations as in the figure below we will now compute this area of the symmetric difference.



$$
\begin{aligned}
area((H_1 \cup H_2) - (H_1 \cap H_2)) &= area(T_1) + area(T_2) + area(T_3) + area(T_4) \\
area(T_1) &= \pi - \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta \\
area(T_2) &= \pi - \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta - x \\
area(T_3) &= \pi - \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta' - y \\
area(T_4) &= \pi - \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta'' - z \\
area((H_1 \cup H_2) - (H_1 \cap H_2)) &= 2\pi - 2\theta - (x + y + z) - (\beta' + \beta'') \\
&= 2\pi - 2\theta - \pi - \beta \\
&= \pi - 2\theta - \beta
\end{aligned}
$$

As b_2 tends to zero, β tends to zero and θ tends to $\frac{\pi}{2}$. It will be slightly easier to see the fact that θ tends to $\frac{\pi}{2}$ if, we take a map which takes p_1 to ∞. See the picture below.



□

Lemma 4.5. *Let H_1, H_2 be the hexagons with sides $(0, b_2, b_3)$ and $(0, 0, b_3)$. Then $d_\rho(H_1, H_2)$ is small if b_2 is small.*

Proof. The same calculations as before would work with the slightly modified picture given below.



□

Lemma 4.6. *Let H_1, H_2 be the hexagons with sides $(0, 0, b_3)$ and $(0, 0, 0)$. Then $d_\rho(H_1, H_2)$ is small if b_3 is small.*

Proof. Again we compute the symmetric difference as in the previous two cases.



$$area((H_1 \cup H_2) - (H_1 \cap H_2)) = area(R_1) + area(R_2)$$
$$area(R_1) = \pi - \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta - \beta$$
$$area(R_2) = \pi - \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta$$
$$area((H_1 \cup H_2) - (H_1 \cap H_2)) = \pi - 2\theta - \beta.$$

As $\theta \to \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\beta \to 0$, we have the result. □

Lemma 4.7. *If $d_\pi^{\mathbb{H}}(H_1, H_2) = \varepsilon$ then the pair of paints P_1 and P_2, formed from H_1 and H_2, satisfy $d_\rho(P_1, P_2) = \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $Z := \mathbb{H} \times \{1, 2\}$, E the union of all edges of H_1 and H_2, and $I : E \times \{1\} \to E \times \{2\}$ be $I(x, 1) = (x, 2)$. Then I is an isometry. So, by Theorem 3.11 the canonical embedding of P_j into (Z, d_I^0) are isometries and $d_\pi^Z(P_1, P_2) = \varepsilon$. Hence the result. □

Thus we have,

Theorem 4.8. *The topology generated by d_ρ is the same as that given by the Fenchel Nielson co-ordinates.*

5. Laminations and Riemann surface laminations

5.1. **Laminations.** We will recall some of the key definitions related to laminations. The exposition here is based on [CC00], [Lyu] and the article on Riemann surface laminations in [CGSY03] by Etienne Ghys.

Roughly speaking, a lamination $\mathcal{L}$ is a topological space which is decomposed into smooth immersed sub-manifolds(called "leaves") nicely organised in a local product structure.

A formal definition goes as follows. A d-dimensional product lamination is a topological space of the form $U^d \times T$, where U^d is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ called a *local leaf* or *plaque*, and T a topological space called *regular transversal*.

A morphism between two product laminations is a continuous map that maps local leaves to local leaves. It is also called a laminar map.

Definition 5.1 (Laminations)**.** A d-dimensional lamination $\mathcal{L}$ (or briefly d-lamination) is a topological space X endowed with the following structure: For any point in $x \in X$ there is a neighbourhood U containing x and a homeomorphism $\phi : U \to U^d \times T$ onto a d-dimensional product lamination $U^d \times T$ such that the transition maps $\phi_2 \circ \phi_1^{-1}|_{\phi_1(U_1 \cap U_2)} : \phi_1(U_1 \cap U_2) \to \phi_2(U_1 \cap U_2)$ between the product laminations are laminar. These homeomorphisms are called local charts. The corresponding neighbourhoods U are called flow boxes. The sets $\phi^{-1}(U^d \times \{t\})$ are called local leaves or plaques of $\mathcal{L}$. The sets $\phi^{-1}(\{x\} \times T)$ are called regular transversals.

Definition 5.2 (Global leaf)**.** Any lamination $\mathcal{L}$ is decomposed into disjoint union of global leaves in the following way: two points x and y belong to the same global leaf if there is a sequence of local leaves $L_0, L_1, ..., L_k$ such that $x \in L_0$, $y \in L_k$ and $L_i \cap L_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 0, 1, ..., k - 1$. The global leaf passing through x will be denoted by $L(x)$.

Definition 5.3. A *transversal* is a Borel subset which intersects each leaf in at-most countably many points.

5.2. **Riemann surface lamination.** A Riemann surface lamination is a locally compact, separable, metrisable space M with an open cover by flow boxes $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ and homeomorphisms $\phi_i : U_i \to D_i \times T_i$, with D_i an open set in $\mathbb{C}$ and T_i a metric space, such that the coordinate changes in $U_i \cap U_j$ are of the form

$$\phi_j \circ \phi_i^{-1}(z,t) = (\lambda_{ji}(z,t), \tau_{ji}(t))$$

where the map $z \to \lambda_{ji}(z,t)$ is holomorphic for each t.

A map $f : M \to N$ of Riemann surface laminations is holomorphic if it is continuous and maps each leaf of M holomorphically to a leaf of N.

5.2.1. *Invariant transverse measures.* A transverse measure for M is a measure on the σ-ring of transversals which restrict to a σ-finite measure on each transversal and such that each compact regular transversal has finite mass. It is called invariant if it is invariant by the holonomy transformations acting on transversals.

5.3. **Hyperbolic Riemann surface lamination.** A Riemann surface lamination is called a hyperbolic Riemann surface lamination if all leaves are hyperbolic Riemann surfaces. By Theorem 4.3 in [Can93] and Proposition 5.7 in the article on Riemann surface laminations in [CGSY03] we know that this matches with the general definition.

6. Compact subsets of the space of Riemann surface laminations

To study Riemann surface laminations using the same techniques, there are some hurdles. Firstly, a lamination structure is just a topological structure and not a metric structure, i.e., the transition maps in the transverse directions are just homeomorphisms. So, If we want to have a natural metric structure, we need to make the definition stricter. A natural class of maps between metric spaces are Lipschitz maps. So we defined

Definition 6.1. An *L-Lipschitz Riemann surface lamination* is a Riemann surface lamination where the coordinate changes $\tau_{ji}(t)$ are L-Lipschitz for all i, j.

Now we can use the leaf-wise metric and the transverse metric to define a metric on a Riemann surface lamination.

Definition 6.2 (Metric on L-Lipschitz Riemann Surface Laminations)**.** To obtain a metric, we use a Kobayashi type construction, namely, we consider the maximal metric on M such that, the maps $\phi_i^{-1} : D_i \times T_i \to U_i$ are distance decreasing functions.

6.1. **Measure on a Riemann surface lamination.** The second hurdle was that a Riemann surface lamination does not come equipped with a measure. But, given an invariant transverse measure ν_i on T_i, on each $D_i \times T_i$ there is a natural measure given by

$$\int_{T_i} \left(\int_{D_i \times \{t\}} \sigma_i \right) d\nu_i(t).$$

where, σ_i is the hyperbolic area measure on D_i.

Lemma 6.3. *If $E \subset U_i \cap U_j$ then,*

$$\int_{T_i}\left(\int_{D_i\times\{t\}} \chi_{\phi_i(E)}\cdot\sigma_i\right)d\nu_i(t) = \int_{T_j}\left(\int_{D_j\times\{t\}} \chi_{\phi_j(E)}\cdot\sigma_j\right)d\nu_j(t).$$

Proof. Observe that, $\phi_j\circ\phi_i^{-1}|_{\phi_i(U_i\cap U_j)}$ and hence $\phi_j\circ\phi_i^{-1}|_{\phi_i(E)}$ are biholomorphisms. Thus they are isometries and area-preserving maps, i.e., $(\phi_j\circ\phi_i^{-1})_*(\sigma_i) = \sigma_j$. Also, the transverse measure is holonomy invariant implies that $\nu_j = (\gamma_{ij})_*(\nu_i)$ where γ_{ij} is the holonomy cocycle corresponding to the charts U_i and U_j. Thus, standard chain rule arguments give us the result. □

Definition 6.4. If the lamination structure is given by charts $\phi_i : U_i \to D_i \times T_i$ then, for $E \subset M$ define μ as

$$\mu(E) = \sum_i \int_{T_i}\left(\int_{D_i\times\{t\}} \chi_{\phi_i(E\setminus(\cup_{j=1}^{i-1}U_j)}\cdot\sigma_i\right)d\nu_i(t)$$

Lemma 6.3 tells us that this definition is independent of the ordering of the charts.

Now we want to prove an analogue of the Bers' compactness theorem for Riemann surface laminations. To this end we will define a notion of injectivity radius. Injectivity radius, in general, tells us to what extent is the given space canonical. So for Riemann surface laminations it should be a measure of the extent to which it is a product lamination. Hence the following definition.

Definition 6.5 (Injectivity radius for L-Lipschitz hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations)**.** Given an L-Lipschitz Riemann surface lamination $(M, \mathcal{L})$, we say the injectivity radius at a point x is greater than r if there exists an injective map $\varphi : B(0, r)(\subset \mathbb{D}) \times T \to M$ such that:

(1) The map $\varphi^{-1}|_{image(\varphi)}$ is a compatible chart.
(2) The point $x = \varphi(0, t)$ for some $t \in T$.
(3) The map φ is an isometry under the metric defined earlier.
(4) The ball $B(x, r) \subset M$ is contained in the image of φ.

6.2. **A topology for the space of Riemann surface laminations.** Let $(X_n, \mathcal{L}_n)$ be a sequence of L-Lipschitz Riemann surface laminations with invariant transverse measure μ_n and $(X, \mathcal{L})$ an L-Lipschitz Riemann surface laminations with invariant transverse measure μ. Let d_n be the induced metric on $(X_n, \mathcal{L}_n)$ and d be the induced metric on $(X, \mathcal{L})$. We say the sequence $(X_n, \mathcal{L}_n, \mu_n)$ converge to $(X, \mathcal{L}, \mu)$ if

- The sequence $d_\rho((X_n, d_n, \mu_n), (X, d, \mu))$ converges to zero.
- There exist a system of compatible charts on $(X, \mathcal{L})$ such that every local parametrisation $\psi : B(0, r)\times T \to X$ is the limit of some local parametrisations $\psi_n : B(0, r)\times T_n \to X_n$, with $T_n \to T$, described in Proposition 3.33.

6.3. **Analogue of Bers' compactness theorem.** Let $\mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ be the collection of all L-Lipschitz hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations equipped with an invariant transverse measure such that,

(1) Injectivity radius is greater than or equal to r.
(2) The measure $\mu(M) \leq A$ for all $M \in \mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$.

(3) Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $B(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for all $m \in M \in \mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ and for all regular transversals T passing through m, the transversal measure of $B(m, \varepsilon) \cap T \geq B(\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 6.6. *Given a distance measure space (X, d, μ) with $\mu(X) \leq A$ and the property, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $B(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $\mu(B(x, \varepsilon)) \geq B(\varepsilon)$ for all $x \in X$, there exists a set S_ε such that $\mu(((S_\varepsilon)^\varepsilon)^C) \leq \varepsilon$ and the cardinality of S_ε is less than or equal to $\frac{A}{B(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})}$.*

Proof. Choose an arbitrary point x_1. If $B(x_1, \varepsilon) \not\supset X$, then choose x_2 to be an arbitrary point in $X \setminus B(x_1, \varepsilon)$. Given that we have choose $x_1, ..., x_k$, if $X \not\subset \cup_{i=1}^k B(x_i, \varepsilon)$, choose x_{k+1} to be an arbitrary point in $X \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k B(x_i, \varepsilon)$. Let, N be the smallest integer strictly greater than $\frac{A}{B(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})}$. We will prove that $X \subset \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, \varepsilon)$ for some $m < N$ using proof by contradiction.

Assume that $X \not\subset \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, \varepsilon)$ for any $m < N$. Note that, $B(x_i, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \cap B(x_j, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = \emptyset$. Therefore, $\mu(X) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(B(x_i, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})) \geq N \times B(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) > A$, which contradicts with the assumption that $\mu(X) \leq A$. Thus, $X \subset \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, \varepsilon)$ for some $m < N$, say m_0.

Thus, $S_\varepsilon = \{x_1, ..., x_{m_0}\}$ satisfies the conditions we wanted. □

Lemma 6.7. *Properties 2 and 3 together implies the property that given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\varepsilon)$ such that, for all $M \in \mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ there exists a set $S_{M,\varepsilon}$ such that $|S_{M,\varepsilon}| \leq N(\varepsilon)$ and $\mu((M_{S,\varepsilon})^\varepsilon)^C) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Note that given a chart $\varphi_x : B(0, r)(\subset \mathbb{D}) \times T \to M$ with $x = \varphi_x(0, t)$, $B(x, \varepsilon) \supset \varphi_x(B_{\mathbb{H}}(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \times B_T(t, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))$. Property 3 implies that $\mu(B_T(t, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})) \geq B(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})$, i.e., $\mu(B(x, \varepsilon))$ is greater than or equal to the hyperbolic area of $B_{\mathbb{H}}(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ times $B(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})$. So, by Lemma 6.6 we have the result. □

Theorem 6.8. *The space $\mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ is compact under the topology described in Section 6.2.*

Proof. Given a sequence of L-Lipschitz hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations M^n in the space $\mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$, compactness theorem of metric measure spaces and Lemma 6.7 implies that M^n converge to a metric measure space M. We will show that $M \in \mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ and M^n converges to M in the topology described in 6.2.

Denote the measure on M^n by μ^n and the measure on M by μ. Note that $d_\rho(M^n, M) \to 0$ implies there exists a sequence of metric spaces (Z^n, d^n) and $L(n)$-isometric $\varepsilon(n)$-embeddings $f^n : M^n \to Z^n$ and $g^n : M \to Z^n$ such that $d_\pi((f^n)_*(\mu^n), (g^n)_*(\mu)) + \frac{1}{L(n)} + \varepsilon(n)$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity.

Lemma 6.9. *The set of all points $x \in M$ such that there exists no sequence $x^n \in M^n$ with $d_{Z^n}(f^n(x^n), g^n(x))$ converging to zero as n tends to infinity is a set of measure zero.*

Proof. Call this set E and assume the contrary, i.e., $\mu(E) > 0$. There exists no sequence $x^n \in M^n$ with $d_{Z^n}(f^n(x^n), g^n(x))$ converging to zero as n tends to infinity, implies, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $d_{Z^n}(f^n(M^n), g^n(E)) > \varepsilon$ for all n. This along with $\mu(E) > 0$ contradicts with the fact that $d_\pi(f^n(\mu^n), g^n(\mu))$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity. □

So, by throwing this set away, without loss of generality we can assume that the set is empty. Thus, given a point $x \in M$ there exists points $x^n \in M^n$ such that $d_{Z^n}(f^n(x^n), g^n(x))$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity. As injectivity radius of M^n is greater than r, for each point in M^n we can find an injective map $\varphi_x : B(0, r)(\subset \mathbb{D}) \times T(x) \to M$ such that:

(1) The map $\varphi^{-1}|_{image(\varphi)}$ is a compatible chart.
(2) The point $x = \varphi(0, t)$ for some $t \in T$.
(3) The map φ is an isometry.
(4) The ball $B(x, r) \subset M$ is contained in the image of φ.

such that the coordinate changes in $U_i \cap U_j$ are of the form

$$\varphi_x \circ \varphi_y^{-1}(z, t) = (\lambda_{xy}(z, t), \tau_{xy}(t))$$

where the map $z \to \lambda_{xy}(z, t)$ is holomorphic for each t and the map $\tau_{xy}(t)$ is L-Lipschitz. Let $\varphi^n : B(0, r)(\subset \mathbb{D}) \times T^n \to M^n$ be such a chart about x^n. We shall use these maps to construct a chart φ around x. First note that,

Lemma 6.10. *The sequence T^n has a subsequence which converges, say to T, as n tends to infinity.*

Proof. Note that,

$$\mu^n(T^n) \leq \frac{\mu^n(M^n)}{Area(B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{D})} \leq \frac{A}{Area(B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{D})}.$$

So, property (3) of elements of $\mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ and Lemma 6.6 implies that $\{T^n \,|\forall n\}$ is a compact subset of the space of metric measure spaces. □

So, without loss of generality, we can assume T_n converges. Now use Proposition 3.33, to construct a measure preserving isometry $\varphi : B(0, r) \times T \to M$.

Transition maps are well-behaved: Let x, y be two points in M and $\varphi : B(0, r) \times S \to M, \psi : B(0, r) \times T \to M$ be local parametrisations created as explained before such that $im(\varphi) \cap im(\psi) \neq \emptyset$. We will prove that $\psi^{-1} \circ \varphi : \varphi^{-1}(\psi(B(0, r) \times T)) \to \psi^{-1}(\varphi(B(0, r) \times S))$ satisfies all conditions to make M an L-Lipschitz Riemann surface lamination.

Let $x^n, y^n \in M^n$ be such that $d_{Z^n}(f^n(x^n), g^n(x))$, $d_{Z^n}(f^n(y^n), g^n(y))$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity. Let $\varphi^n : B(0, r) \times S(x^n) \to M^n$ and $\psi^n : B(0, r) \times T(y^n) \to M^n$ be charts around x^n and y^n respectively. As $im(\varphi) \cap im(\psi) \neq \emptyset$, $im(\varphi^n) \cap im(\psi^n) \neq \emptyset$ for large enough n. We have seen before that $d_\rho(S(x^n), S), d_\rho(T(y^n), T)$ can be assumed to be converging to zero. Construct $h^n : S \setminus \widehat{S} \to S(x^n)$ and $j^n : T(y^n) \setminus \widehat{T(y^n)} \to T$ as in Theorem 3.14. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi^{-1} \circ \varphi(z, t) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} (id \times j^n) \circ ((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ \varphi^n) \circ (id \times h^n)(z, t) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} (id \times j^n) \circ ((\psi^n)^{-1} \circ \varphi^n)(z, h^n(t)) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} (id \times j^n)(\lambda^n(z, h^n(t)), \tau^n(h^n(t))) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} (\lambda^n(z, h^n(t)), j^n(\tau^n(h^n(t)))) \\
&= (\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda^n(z, h^n(t)), \lim_{n\to\infty} j^n(\tau^n(h^n(t)))).
\end{aligned}$$

It can be proved as in the proof of Proposition 3.33 that given $\lambda^n : B(0, r) \times S(x^n) \to B(0, r)$ and $\tau^n : S(x^n) \to T(x^n)$ there exists $\lambda : B(0, r) \times S \to B(0, r)$ and $\tau : S \to T$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda^n(z, h^n(t)) = \lambda(z, t)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} j^n(\tau^n(h^n(t))) = \tau(t)$. To do this just note that to prove that the function is well defined we only needed that Cauchy sequences goes to Cauchy sequences. As Lipschitz maps satisfy this we are done. We have λ for a fixed t is holomorphic by Montel's theorem.

Define $\delta_3^n = d_\rho(S(x^n), S)$ and $\delta_4^n = d_\rho(T(y^n), T)$. Given $t, s \in T$, choose n so large that $d(s,t) \leq \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\delta_3^n} - 2\delta_3^n\right), \left(\frac{1}{\delta_3^n} - 2\delta_3^n - 2\delta_4^n\right)\right\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d(j^n(\tau^n(h^n(t))), j^n(\tau^n(h^n(s)))) &\leq d(\tau^n(h^n(t)), \tau^n(h^n(s))) + 2\delta_4^n (\text{Theorem 3.14}) \\ &\leq L \times d(h^n(t), h^n(s)) + 2\delta_4^n (\tau^n \text{is } L\text{-Lipshcitz}) \\ &\leq L \times d(t, s) + 2\delta_3^n + 2\delta_4^n (\text{Theorem 3.14}). \end{aligned}$$

As δ_3^n and δ_4^n tends to zero as n tends to infinity, this shows that τ is L- Lipschitz.

□

Theorem 6.11. *Let $\mathcal{X}(L, A)$ be the collection of all L-Lipschitz hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations equipped with an invariant transverse measure such that*

1. *The measure $\mu(M) \leq A$ for all $M \in \mathcal{X}(L, A)$.*
2. *Given ε there exists $B(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for all $m \in M \in \mathcal{X}(L, A)$ and for all transversals T passing through m, the transversal measure of $B(m, \varepsilon) \cap T \geq B(\varepsilon)$.*
3. *If $M(r)$ denotes the subset of M where injectivity radius is less than or equal to r then $\mu(M(r))$ goes uniformly to zero for all $M \in \mathcal{X}(L, A)$ as r goes to zero.*

Then, $\mathcal{X}(L, A)$ is compact under the topology described in Section 6.2.

Remark 6.12. Condition 3 is required for the limit to have the structure of a lamination. This was redundant in the case of Riemann surfaces because of Margulis lemma. In Section 6.7 we have showed that it is not redundant for Riemann surface laminations.

Proof. Given a sequence of L-Lipschitz hyperbolic Riemann surface laminations M^n in the space $\mathcal{X}(L, A)$, consider the sequence $M^n \setminus M^n(r)$. Now this sequence has a convergent subsequence by previous theorem. Without loss of generality we can assume that $M^n \setminus M^n(r)$ converges and the limit is M_r. If $r_1 \geq r_2$ then we have an inclusion from $M_{r_1} \hookrightarrow M_{r_2}$. Consider the direct limit of the sequence M_r as r tends to zero and call it M. Observe that M is a lamination, as every point in M belongs to M_r for some r so, use the chart around that point in M_r. Furthermore,

$$d_\rho(M^n, M) \leq d_\rho(M^n, M^n \setminus M^n(r)) + d_\rho(M^n \setminus M^n(r), M_r) + d_\rho(M_r, M)$$

The first term goes to zero as r tends to zero, the second term goes to zero as n tends to infinity and the third term goes to zero as r tends to zero. Thus M^n converges to M as n tends to infinity. □

We will now show that $\mathcal{X}(L, A)$ is far from being empty. Below are some examples.

6.4. **Finite covers.** Let S be a hyperbolic Riemann surface and let $p : M \to S$ be an N-sheeted covering. By definition of covering given any point, $p \in S$, there exists an evenly covered neighbourhood, U. Thus, we have a map $\phi : U \times \{1, 2, ...N\} \to p^{-1}(U)$ such that $\phi|_{U \times \{i\}}$ is a biholomorphism. We will define a metric and measure on each transversal, i.e., $p^{-1}(x_0)$ for all $x_0 \in S$, so that $M \in \mathcal{X}(L, r, A)$ for some L, r, A. Define the measure on T, ν, as follows:

$$\nu(\{i\}) = \frac{1}{N}$$

Define the metric on $p^{-1}(x_0)$ as follows:

$$d(m_1, m_2) = \frac{1}{N}$$

Remark 6.13. Note that this Riemann surface lamination is 1-Lipschitz.

Lemma 6.14. *Injectivity radius of the Riemann surface lamination M at a point m is greater than or equal to injectivity radius of the Riemann surface S at the point $p(m)$.*

Proof. If $r = \text{injrad}_{p(m)}(S)$, then $B(p(m), r)$ is evenly covered. Thus, we have the result. □

Lemma 6.15. *If we denote the area measure on S by μ and the measure induced on M by the lamination structure as $\overline{\mu}$, then $\overline{\mu}(p^{-1}(U)) = \mu(U)$. Hence $\overline{\mu}(M) = \mu(S)$*

Lemma 6.16. $\nu(B(t, \varepsilon)) \geq \min\{1, \varepsilon\}$

Proof. If $\varepsilon \lneq \frac{1}{N}$ then $\nu(B(t, \varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{N} \gneq \varepsilon$. If $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{N}$ then, $\nu(B(t, \varepsilon)) = 1$. Thus, $\nu(B(t, \varepsilon)) \geq \min(1, \varepsilon)$. □

Also, as the measure of every point is same under the measure we defined, it is invariant under holonomy transformations. Thus we have,

Theorem 6.17. *The space of finite covers of a Riemann surface S is a subset of the space $\mathcal{X}(1, injrad(S), Area(S))$.*

Remark 6.18. Note that if the cover is connected, there is only one leaf for this foliation. Thus, given a finite cover X of S, X with this lamination structure is isomorphic to X as a surface (considered as trivial lamination).

Remark 6.19. Even though there is only one leaf, X with this lamination structure is different from the surface X (considered as trivial lamination) as L-Lipschitz Riemann surface laminations.

Remark 6.20. Furthermore, we get interesting laminations as limits of these laminations. This will be the next example.

6.5. **Solenoid.** Given a sequence $X_0, X_1, X_2, ...$ of surfaces, and regular coverings $f_{n,n-1} : X_n \to X_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the inverse limit of this sequence, X_∞ will be called a Solenoidal space. Recall the definition of an inverse limit:

Inverse Limit: Let $X_0, X_1, X_2, ...$ be countable sequence of topological spaces, and suppose that for each $n > 0$ there exists a function $f_{n,n-1} : X_n \to X_{n-1}$, called bonding maps. The sequence of spaces and mappings, $\{X_n, f_{n,n-1}\}$, is called an inverse limit sequence and may be represented by the diagram

$$... \xrightarrow{f_{n+1,n}} X_n \xrightarrow{f_{n,n-1}} X_{n-1} \xrightarrow{f_{n-1,n-2}} ... \xrightarrow{f_{1,0}} X_0$$

Clearly if $n > m$ then there exists a map $f_{n,m} : X_n \to X_m$ given by the composition $f_{n,m} = f_{m+1,m} \circ f_{m+2,m+1} \circ ... \circ f_{n-1,n-2} \circ f_{n,n-1}$.

Consider a sequence $(x_0, x_1, ..., x_n, ...)$ such that $x_n \in X_n$ and $f_{n+1}(x_{n+1}) = x_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. Such a sequence can be identified with a point in the product space $\Pi_{n=0}^{\infty} X_n$. The set of all such sequences is thus a subset of $\Pi_{n=0}^{\infty} X_n$ and hence has a topology as a subspace. This

topological space is the inverse limit space of the sequence $\{X_n, f_{n,n-1}\}$. We will denote it by X_∞ and let $f_n : X_\infty \to X_n$ be the canonical projection.

Given a point $(x_0, x_1, ...) \in X_\infty$ we have, as described earlier, local parametrisations $\varphi_n : B(0,r) \times T_n \to X_n$ where $r \leq \text{injrad}(X_0)$ with $x_n = \varphi(0,t) \in Image(\varphi_n)$. Similarly, if π_n is the canonical projection from $B(0,r) \times T_n \to T_n$, the sequence $\{T_n, h_{n,n-1} := \pi_{n-1}((\phi_{n-1})^{-1} \circ f_{n,n-1} \circ \phi_n(0,t))\}$ is an inverse limit sequence. Let T_∞ be the inverse limit of the sequence $\{T_n, h_{n,n-1}\}$.

Denote the map, $(x,t) \mapsto (x, h_n(t))$, from $B(0,r) \times T_\infty$ to $B(0,r) \times T_n$ by g_n. Corresponding to the maps $\varphi_n \circ g_n : B(0,r) \times T_\infty \to X_n$ there exists a unique map $\varphi_\infty : B(0,r) \times T_\infty \to X_\infty$ around the point $(x_0, x_1, ...) \in X_\infty$. More precisely, $\varphi_\infty : (x,t) \mapsto (\varphi_0 \circ g_0(x,t), \varphi_1 \circ g_1(x,t), ...)$. We will show that this map is injective.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_\infty(x,s) = \varphi_\infty(y,s) &\iff \varphi_n \circ g_n(x,t) = \varphi_n \circ g_n(y,s),\ \forall n. \\
&\iff \varphi_n(x, h_n(t)) = \varphi_n(y, h_n(s)),\ \forall n. \\
&\iff x = y \text{ and } h_n(s) = h_n(t),\ \forall n.\ (\varphi_n \text{ is injective}) \\
&\iff x = y \text{ and } s = t
\end{aligned}$$

By similar analysis we can show that transition maps behave well. Thus, X_∞ has a lamination structure.

Definition 6.21 (Measure on T_n)**.** Define a measure ν_n on T_n recursively as

$$\nu_n(t) = \frac{\nu_{n-1}(h_{n,n-1}(t))}{\deg(h_{n,n-1})},\ \forall\ t \in T_n.$$

As every point in T_n has the same measure, this measure is clearly holonomy invariant.

Definition 6.22 (Measure on T_∞)**.** Define ν_∞ on T_∞ as

$$\nu_\infty(E) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \nu_n(h_n(E)).$$

The sequence $\nu_n(h_n(E))$ is a decreasing sequence bounded below by zero. Hence, the limit exists. Moreover, as each ν_n is holonomy invariant, the limit ν_∞ is also holonomy invariant.

Metric on T_n: From the inverse limit sequence $\{T_n, h_{n,n-1}\}$ we can produce a rooted tree. The vertices of the tree are the elements of $\sqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_n$. There is an edge between two vertices if they belong to consecutive T_n's and the bonding map takes the element in T_n to the element in T_{n-1}. Assign a length of $\log_2(\deg(h_{n,n-1}))$ to an edge connecting an element in T_n with an element in T_{n-1}. This way we get a rooted tree with the lone element in T_0 being the root. See figure below.



Definition 6.23 (Gromov product)**.** Given two points, $x_1 \in T_{n_1}$ and $x_2 \in T_{n_2}$, define

$$x \vee y = \max\{m \mid h_{n_1,m}(x_1) = h_{n_2,m}(x_2)\}.$$

Note that $0 \leq m \leq \min(n_1, n_2)$. The Gromov product, $(x_1|x_2)$, is defined as the length of the unique path from $h_{n_1,(x\vee y)}(x_1) = h_{n_2,(x\vee y)}(x_2)$ to the root.

Definition 6.24 (Metric on T_n)**.** The distance, d_{T_n}, is defined as

$$d_{T_n}(x, y) = 2^{-(x|y)} \text{ if } x \neq y, \ \forall x, y \in T_n$$
$$d_{T_n}(x, x) = 0$$

Triangle inequality: Given points $x, y, z \in T_n$, if $h_{n,m}(x) = h_{n,m}(y)$, then $h_{n,m'}(x) = h_{n,m'}(y)$ for all $m' \leq m$. Similarly for any other combination of two points. Let m be the largest number such that $h_{n,m}(x) = h_{n,m}(y)$ and let k be the largest number such that $h_{n,k}(y) = h_{n,k}(z)$. Then $h_{n,\min(m,k)}(x) = h_{n,\min(m,k)}(y) = h_{n,\min(m,k)}(z)$, i.e., $x \vee z \geq \min(x \vee y, y \vee z)$ which implies that $(x|z) \geq \min((x|y), (y|z))$. Hence, $2^{-(x|z)} \leq \max(2^{-(x|y)}, 2^{-(y|z)})$, i.e., $d_{T_n}(x, z) \leq \max(d_{T_n}(x, y), d_{T_n}(y, z)) \leq d_{T_n}(x, y) + d_{T_n}(y, z)$.

Definition 6.25 (Metric on T_∞)**.** Define a metric on T_∞ as

$$d_\infty(s, t) := \lim_{n\to\infty} d_{T_n}(h_n(s), h_n(t)).$$

Note that the bonding maps $h_{n,n-1}$ are distance decreasing. Thus, $0 \leq d_{T_n}(h_n(s), h_n(t)) \leq d_{T_{n+1}}(h_{n+1}(s), h_{n+1}(t)) \leq ....$ On the other hand it is bounded above by 1. Hence the above limit exists.
If $h_n(s) \neq h_n(t)$ then, $d_\infty(s, t) = d_{T_n}(h_n(s), h_n(t))$. Otherwise

$$d_\infty(s, t) \leq \frac{1}{\deg(h_{1,0}) \times \deg(h_{2,1}) \times ... \times \deg(h_{n,n-1})}.$$

and $d_{T_n}(h_n(s), h_n(t)) = 0$. Thus,

$$d_\infty(s, t) - d_{T_n}(h_n(s), h_n(t)) \leq \frac{1}{\deg(h_{1,0}) \times \deg(h_{2,1}) \times ... \times \deg(h_{n,n-1})} =: \delta_n.$$

It is clear that δ_n tends to zero as n tends to infinity. Define $Z_n = T_n \sqcup T_\infty$ with metric on Z_n defined as $d_{Z_n} = d_{h_n}^{\delta_n}$. By Theorem 3.11 the inclusions $T_n \hookrightarrow Z_n$ and $T_\infty \hookrightarrow Z_n$ are

isometries. The Prokhorov distance between the push-forward measures is less than or equal to δ_n ($\nu_n(E) \leq \nu_\infty(E^{\delta_n+\varepsilon})$ and $\nu_\infty(E) \leq \nu_n(E^{\delta_n+\varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$). Thus, $d_\rho(T_n, T_\infty)$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity.

Use the metric on T_n along with the local parametrisations for X_n to construct a metric on X_n. More precisely, choose the maximal metric such that all the local parametrisations are distance decreasing. Similarly, use the metric on T_∞ along with the local parametrisations for X_∞ to construct a metric on X_∞. More precisely, choose the maximal metric such that all the local parametrisations are distance decreasing. Then, it can be proved that $d_{X_\infty}(x, y) := \lim_{n\to\infty} d_{X_n}(f_n(x), f_n(y))$. Thus, as before define $Z_n = X_n \sqcup X_\infty$ and define the metric on Z_n as $d_{Z_n} = d^{\delta_n}_{h_n}$. As before, the inclusions $X_n \hookrightarrow Z_n$ and $X_\infty \hookrightarrow Z_n$ are isometries by Theorem 3.11 and the Prokhorov distance between the push-forward measures is less than or equal to δ_n. Thus, $d_\rho(X_n, X_\infty)$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity.

Lemma 6.26. *Given $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{deg(h_{1,0})}$, let $n(\varepsilon)$ be the smallest number, n, such that*

$$\zeta_n := \frac{1}{\deg(h_{1,0}) \times \deg(h_{2,1}) \times ... \times \deg(h_{n,n-1})} < \varepsilon.$$

Then,

$$\nu_n(B(t, \varepsilon)) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\deg(h_{n(\varepsilon),n(\varepsilon)-1})}.$$

Proof. Note that $\zeta_{n(\varepsilon)-1} > \varepsilon$, i.e., $\deg(h_{n(\varepsilon),n(\varepsilon)-1}).\zeta_{n(\varepsilon)} > \varepsilon$. If $n > n(\varepsilon)$ then, $B(t, \varepsilon)$ contains all s such that $h_{n,n(\varepsilon)}(s) = h_{n,n(\varepsilon)}(t)$. Thus, by definition of ν_n,

$$\nu_n(B(t, \varepsilon)) = \nu_{n(\varepsilon)}(h_{n,n(\varepsilon)}(t)) = \zeta_{n(\varepsilon)} > \frac{\varepsilon}{\deg(h_{n(\varepsilon),n(\varepsilon)-1})}.$$

If $n \leq n(\varepsilon)$, $B(t, \varepsilon)$ contains all points in T_n. So $\mu(B(t, \varepsilon)) = 1$. Hence the result. □

Also, If $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{deg(h_{1,0})}$, then $B(t, \varepsilon) = T_n$. As $n(\varepsilon)$ depends only on ε and does not depend on n, given ε, there exists a uniform lower bound on the the volume of ε-ball in T_n. Thus this along with Lemma 6.15 and Lemma 6.14 gives us

Lemma 6.27. $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathcal{X}(1, injrad(X_0), Area(X_0))$

Theorem 6.28. $X_\infty \in \mathcal{X}(1, injrad(X_0), Area(X_0))$

Proof. As $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathcal{X}(1, \text{injrad}(X_0), Area(X_0))$ and $\mathcal{X}(1, \text{injrad}(X_0), Area(X_0))$ is compact, $X_\infty \in \mathcal{X}(1, \text{injrad}(X_0), Area(X_0))$. □

Theorem 6.29. *The Riemann surface lamination X_∞ has more than one leaf.*

Proof. The intersection of a transversal with a leaf is discrete on the leaf with respect to the leaf wise metric. The second countability of the leaf (separability is preserved under inverse limit) implies that the number of intersections of any transversal with a leaf is countable. For a generic inverse sequence $\{T_n, h_{n,n-1}\}$, T_∞ is the cantor set hence, uncountable. Thus, such a lamination will have more than one leaf. □

6.6. **Suspension.** In this section we will closely follow section 3.1 of [CC00]. Let S be a closed hyperbolic surface and $p : \mathbb{H} \to S$ be the universal covering map. We adopt the convention that the group Γ of covering transformations acts from the right:

$$\mathbb{H} \times \Gamma \to S$$
$$(z, \gamma) \mapsto z.\gamma = \gamma^{-1}(z)$$

Fix a metric space F together with a choice of base-point $z_0 \in p^{-1}(x_0)$, and let

$$h : \Gamma \to Isom(F)$$

be a group homomorphism. The choice of base-point fixes an identification $\Gamma = \pi_1(S, x_0)$. We define the "diagonal" action of Γ on $\mathbb{H} \times F$ to be the left action.

$$\Gamma \times (\mathbb{H} \times F) \to \mathbb{H} \times F$$
$$(\gamma, (z, y)) \mapsto (z.\gamma^{-1}, \gamma.y)$$

where $\gamma.y = h(\gamma)(y)$. The quotient space

$$M = \Gamma \setminus (\mathbb{H} \times F) = \mathbb{H} \times_\Gamma F$$

has a Riemann surface lamination structure. The projection $\mathbb{H} \times F \to S$ defined by

$$(z, y) \mapsto p(z)$$

respects the group action, hence passes to a well-defined submersion

$$\pi : M \to S.$$

Let $x \in S$ choose a neighbourhood U of x that is evenly covered by p. That is,

$$p^{-1}(U) = \coprod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} U_i$$

and $p|U_i : U_i \to U$ is a biholomorphism, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. The family $\{U_i \times F\}$ consists of disjoint open subsets of $\mathbb{H} \times F$ that are permuted simply transitively by the diagonal action of Γ. Thus, the equivalence relation defined by the action of Γ makes no internal identification in any of the sets $U_i \times F$ and the quotient projections carries each one onto $\pi^{-1}(U)$. The inverse φ_i of this gives a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \pi^{-1}(U) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} & U_i \times F & \xrightarrow{p \times id} & U \times F \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_1} \\ U & \xrightarrow{id} & U & \xrightarrow{id} & U \end{array}$$

where p_1 is the projection onto the first factor. This gives a Riemann surface lamination structure to M. As h maps to $Isom(F)$, we have a 1-Lipschitz Riemann surface lamination. As in the previous example the injectivity radius of M, as a Riemann surface lamination, is greater than or equal to the injectivity radius of S. Choose a finite measure μ on F, invariant under isometries of F and satisfying the condition, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $B(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for all $t \in T$, $\mu(B(t, \varepsilon)) \geq B(\varepsilon)$. Then, $M \in \mathcal{X}(1, \text{injrad}(S), Area(S) \times \mu(F))$.

6.7. **Sequence of laminations with no convergent subsequence.** Let S be a genus two surface such that, the thin part is isometric to the hyperbolic annulus $T(\lambda)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we will define an L-Lipschitz Riemann surface lamination structure on this surface as follows.

Definition of $\mathcal{L}_n$: Given $0 < \varepsilon < C_m$, the Margulis constant, every point in the thick part has a neighbourhood that is isometric to the standard ball of radius ε in $\mathbb{H}$. Construct such charts around points in the thick part for $\varepsilon < \frac{C_m}{2}$. Thus, if we define a compatible chart for the thin part as well, we get a lamination structure on S.

The canonical $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ action on S^1 induces a group action on the annulus. Let $p : T(\lambda) \to T(\lambda)/(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ be the quotient map induced by this group action. So as in Section 6.4 we get a lamination structure on $T(\lambda)$. More precisely, given any point in $T(\lambda)/(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ there exists an evenly covered neighbourhood U and a map $U \times \{1, ..., n\} \to p^{-1}(U)$. We define a metric and measure on each transversal. The metric on $T_n := \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ is the discrete metric

$$d_n(i, j) = \frac{C_m}{n}$$

Define the measure on T_n as

$$\nu_n(\{i\}) = 1$$

Use an isometry, ψ, from $T(\lambda)$ to the thin part of S to get a lamination on the thin part. It is easy to see that this lamination structure is compatible to the one we defined on the thick part. So we have a lamination on S. This lamination is 1-Lipschitz. Denote the induced distance on S by D_n and the induced measure by μ_n.

Let $E(C_m)$ be the thin part of S. Note that for every point in $E(C_m)$, the injectivity radius in $(S, \mathcal{L}_n)$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity. On the other hand, if σ_g is the area form on $T(\lambda)$, $\mu_n(E(C_m)) = \int_{T(\lambda)} \sigma_g$ for E subset of the thin part, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus the measure of $\mu_n(E(C_m))$ is equal to the hyperbolic area of $T(\lambda)$. So, the measure of the part of $(S, \mathcal{L}_n, \mu_n)$ with injectivity less than r, does not converge to zero uniformly as r tends to zero. Thus, there is no theorem analogous to the Margulis lemma for surface laminations. We will also show that this sequence does not have any convergent subsequence.

Let $E\left(\frac{C_m}{2}\right)$ be the subset of S with injectivity radius less than or equal to $\frac{C_m}{2}$. Fixing a normal to the shortest geodesic, the distance from the shortest geodesic gives a map, f, from $E\left(\frac{C_m}{2}\right)$ to an interval $[-l, l]$. Define a measure, ν, on $[-l, l]$ as $\nu = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_*(\mu_n)$. We will show that $\left(E\left(\frac{C_m}{2}\right), D_n, \mu_n\right)$ converges to $([-l, l], |x - y|, \nu)$.

Let $Z_n = E\left(\frac{C_m}{2}\right) \cup [-l, l]$ and the distance on Z_n be defined as $d_{Z_n} = d_f^{\frac{C_m}{n}}$. Notice that the inclusions $E\left(\frac{C_m}{2}\right) \hookrightarrow Z_n$ and $[-l, l] \hookrightarrow Z_n$ are isometries by Theorem 3.11. Abusing notation we will denote the push forwards of μ_n and ν to Z_n by μ_n and ν itself. Then, $d_\pi^{Z_n}(\mu_n, \nu) \leq \frac{C_m}{n} + d_\pi^{[-l,l]}(f_*(\mu_n), \nu)$. Thus, the sequence $d_\rho\left(\left(E\left(\frac{C_m}{2}\right), D_n, \mu_n\right), ([-l, l], |x - y|, \nu)\right)$ converges to zero. But, $[-l.l]$ cannot have any Riemann surface lamination structure as, the Hausdorff dimension of an interval is 1, whereas, the Hausdorff dimension of a Riemann surface lamination is greater than or equal to 2.

References

[BBI01] Dmitri Burago, Yuri Burago, and Sergei Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*, volume 33 of *Graduate studies in mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[Bus10] Peter Buser. *Geometry and spectra of compact Riemann surfaces*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2010. Reprint of the 1992 edition.

[Can93] Alberto Candel. Uniformization of surface laminations. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 26(4):489–516, 1993.

[CC00] Alberto Candel and Lawrence Conlon. *Foliations. I*, volume 23 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.

[CGSY03] Dominique Cerveau, Étienne Ghys, Nessim Sibony, and Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. *Complex dynamics and geometry*, volume 10 of *SMF/AMS Texts and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2003. With the collaboration of Marguerite Flexor, Papers from the Meeting "State of the Art of the Research of the Société Mathématique de France" held at the École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, Lyon, January 1997, Translated from the French by Leslie Kay.

[GK13] Siddhartha Gadgil and Manjunath Krishnapur. Lipschitz correspondence between metric measure spaces and random distance matrices. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (24):5623–5644, 2013.

[GPW09] Andreas Greven, Peter Pfaffelhuber, and Anita Winter. Convergence in distribution of random metric measure spaces (Λ-coalescent measure trees). *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 145(1-2):285–322, 2009.

[Gro07] Misha Gromov. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, english edition, 2007. Based on the 1981 French original, With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes, Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates.

[Lyu] Mikhail Lyubich. Laminations and holomorphic dynamics. *Notes*.

[Par05] K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2005. Reprint of the 1967 original.

[vG03] Onno van Gaans. Probability measures on metric spaces, notes of the seminar ÂŚstochastic evolution equationsÂŠ. *Delft University of Technology*, 2003.